

# AMERICAN SLAVERY DEFEATED

IN ITS ATTEMPTS,

THROUGH

THE AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS,

TO FIND A SHELTER IN THE BRITISH CHURCHES.

BEING

A CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF ENGLAND AND WALES,

ON THE

“AMERICAN BOARD OF MISSIONS AND SLAVERY,”

WITH THE

DISCUSSION WHICH FOLLOWED AT THE AUTUMNAL MEETINGS OF THE UNION AT  
NEWCASTLE, IN OCTOBER, 1854.

BY JAMES VINCENT,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL,

*Agent of the American Reform Tract and Book Society, Cincinnati.*

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY REV. PROFESSOR SCOTT,

AIREDALE COLLEGE, BRADFORD, YORKSHIRE.

---

LONDON:

W. TWEEDIE, 337, STRAND.

---

*Price One Shilling.*

Introduction.

## PREFACE.

---

5-27-32

THE following pages are for reading, for studying, and not for criticising. They contain facts which should be well pondered by every Christian in the land.

We know of no feeling of hostility to any one. For Mr. Young we never have felt any unkindness; we *have* felt that he was in error when he called us a "false witness;" we think that he ought not to have done this, for we are sure that there is not one word of untruth, or is any fact distorted, in the following pages. We know our business too well, and understand mankind too well to hazard a cause which is in our hearts to live and to die for, by using any means but the most unquestionable and sure.

5-5-3d

If we have been severe with other parties, it has been only from a sense of duty. We hate tyranny, and despise tyrants; and the only treatment which they deserve is that which shall have a tendency to lay them, not even with the ground, but *beneath* it.

Edwards

Most of the members of the Committee of the Congregational Union we believe to be most antagonistic to slavery; but to say that we believe this to be the case with all, we cannot, for we do *not* believe it. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." A fly in the ointment causeth it to stink; and one member in a Committee tainted with *carefulness* towards the most unrighteous system of slavery, or any of its supporters, is a poison which will spread and be felt by every member, and, ultimately, by the entire body.

For the Congregational Union, as a body, we have such admiration as words cannot express, for the action which they have recently taken on slavery. Its effect will never cease to be felt till slavery and the entire system shall be no more.

For the following Introduction by Professor Scott we beg the careful perusal of all our readers.

To the Rev. W. Parkes, and F. W. Chesson, Esq., of Manchester, we are greatly indebted for important services rendered in the prosecution of our mission.

Ben. Coll. Inc.

The Editors of the *Manchester Examiner* and *Times*, the *Leeds Mercury*, the *Nonconformist*, and the *Patriot*, were so kind as to give publicity to the following letters to the Congregational Union, at a time when important and interesting intelligence from abroad required their space. We feel that the anti-slavery cause is under lasting obligations for the service they have rendered it.

London, Nov. 1st, 1854.

## INTRODUCTION.

---

EVERY one who has intelligently read the history, and considered the present state and the future prospects of the world, must feel deeply interested in everything that relates to the United States of America. The recent origin of that republic; its rapid growth, presenting the phenomenon of a nation, an empire, born, as it were, in a day; its vigorous and successful struggles against injustice, and in behalf of its own independence; its liberal institutions; its benevolent and religious Societies; the intelligence and energy of its inhabitants; their anxiety and determination to enlarge their territories; and the numerous facilities and almost boundless scope they have for accomplishing their purpose,—all these may well excite thrilling emotions in the breasts of all its friends, and, indeed, of the friends of the human race, and induce them to ask, with deep emotion, what part is it to act as it regards the future condition of the world, and especially in relation to the cause of truth and liberty? Musing on these subjects, how often do her well-wishers exclaim, “O that it were free from the foul blot, the infatuation, the curse of slavery in one of its most degrading forms! How rapid would be the improvement of the whole country; how beautiful its form; how glorious its course in the path of prosperity and honour; how beneficial its influence on the character of the human race! Alas! that it should be the chief support of slavery, the foulest demon, with the exception of sin itself, that ever rose from hell to afflict and degrade the human race!” There are not a few persons in England who can well remember that in their youthful days, before their attention was much directed to the subject of slavery, and to the extent of its existence in the United States, they were ardent admirers of its constitution—converts, in fact, to republicanism; some of them even wished that they had the opportunity of leaving their native country, and of taking up their abode in what appeared to them to be the land, the chosen abode, of freedom. But they have been effectually awakened from this delusive dream. What a change has the recent and present conduct of America effected in their views and feelings! Now they are thoroughly re-converted (Lynch law has had something to do in effecting this change), and are more warmly attached than ever to the limited monarchy of England, with its free institutions, and constantly increasing liberal spirit, and its vigorous and honourable exertions to banish slavery from the world. In this blessed work it has no rival. We glory in the name of Britons, and in the efforts which our country has made to proclaim liberty to the captives, and to induce others to follow her example,—and that in regard to slavery, she is the champion of liberty. Alas, that America should be the champion of slavery—of cruel oppression! It is our boast that the air and the soil of the territories of Britain secure liberty to all who breathe the one and tread on the other. The air of America is contaminated, and her soil polluted by the evil genius of slavery. There is a river which flows between the dominions of Britain in one part of the world and the so-called Free States of America,—and it is like the cloud that parted the Egyptians and the Israelites; on the one side broods the darkness of slavery, and the shrieks of its victims and the clanking of their chains are heard; on the other, all is illuminated and blessed by the light of liberty, while the joyful acclamations of recently liberated slaves are heard all around. Thanks be to God that Britain has the power, at so great a distance from the centre of her authority, to defy the rage, and to stop the ravages of the demon of oppression, and to say to it, though backed by all the power of the mightiest republic in the world, “Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther,” and to afford a safe refuge to the weakest and the most deeply injured of the human race.

To the eye of piety and benevolence, America presents the most appalling and

lamentable spectacle of the kind ever exhibited in the world. How deplorable is it, that with her rapidly increasing population and augmenting power; with her free constitution (*theoretically*) and liberal forms of polity; with her thousands of excellent and pious men and women; with the light of truth shining all around; with her Bibles, and sanctuaries, and preachers; with her noble benevolent and religious institutions; her Bible and Missionary Societies,—should still be the last refuge, the stronghold, of slavery! And yet this is the case; for if it could be abolished in America, it might soon be abolished throughout the world. And do not its supporters see this? Hence their united and vigorous efforts to extend its territories and increase the number of both its victims and friends. How inconceivably strange—how lamentable is it, that professors of religion, and ministers of the Gospel, should be found amongst the most powerful defenders of this stronghold! If they would but lift up their voice as they ought to do against this monstrous iniquity, it might soon be brought to an end. What a gross perversion of the Bible, and of the religion of Jesus Christ, to endeavour to press them into the support of slavery,—an institution most evidently incompatible with the great command and principle of both, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;” and, “Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.”

How grieving it is to the hearts of all the friends of America, that her Bible and Tract and Missionary Societies should not only connive at slavery, but indirectly, at least, nay, more than indirectly, support it. Our transatlantic friends and brethren may rest satisfied, that such as have now been expressed are the views and feelings of thousands in England; nay, it might be said, of the whole nation. It is because we love them and their country, that we speak so plainly and forcibly on this subject, and that we may sometimes utter what they may count *hard things*. We think it is our duty to “rebuke our brethren and not suffer sin on them.” There are several of us, who cannot go so far as some anti-slavery men in America do, who maintain that no man who keeps a slave, in any circumstances, can be truly pious. We must make allowance for circumstances and habits, and not forget the facts of history. But we believe that a man may be a true Christian, and yet be acting such a part, that it might be right to exclude him from the table of the Lord, and therefore to refuse to have this kind of fellowship with him. 1 Cor. v. 11, “If any one that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat.” We think that slaveholding is worse than some of the sins that are enumerated in this passage; and, owing to the very principles of that constitution in which the Americans glory, the religious privileges which they enjoy, the light that shines around them, the examples which they have set before them, the remonstrances and appeals which have been addressed to them from time to time, the striking exhibitions which have been presented to them of the atrocities of slavery by their own country men and women, and on account of the peculiarity of some of the features of that peculiar institution,—we must think that slaveholding is more inexcusable in America,—that slavery is a greater crime and sin there, than it is, or ever was, in any other part of the world.

Such being the views and feelings of British Christians, no wonder that many of them strongly sympathise with Mr. Vincent and the Society of which he is the agent. They even feel thankful to God for sending him amongst us; and for the disclosures, painful as several of them are, which he has made, respecting the conduct of some religious bodies in America. The more respectable and even excellent, in one point of view, that these Societies are, on account of their great object, the numbers and virtues of their adherents, and the influence which they can exert, the more deplorable is it that they should support slavery in any way or form; that they do not con-

demn it in the most unqualified manner, and exert all their power to banish it from the world—especially from their own country. I, for one, and I know that very many are of the same opinion, must think that Mr. Vincent has substantiated the charge which he brought against the American Board of Missions. I have read not only his papers, but those of Mr. Young, as well as listened to verbal defences of that Board, and to the reasons which are assigned for fraternising with them in Turkey; but my views remain unchanged. No one can rejoice more than I do in the efforts which are being made in Syria to diffuse the light of truth; and I can contemplate with pleasure any success that may be realised by the American agents; still I must, by refusing to support them, manifest my disapproval of the part which the Board has acted in another part of the world; and from which it has not yet entirely desisted. Most heartily would I join the Western Missions' Aid Society, if it would disconnect itself with the American Board, and act for itself; none can more highly respect than I do the many excellent men that belong to it: but still I must beg leave to differ from them as it regards the American Board of Missions. I must think that Mr. Young is not consistent with himself when he writes, "As regards the Western Asia Missions' Aid Society," or, as its title is in full, "The Association in Aid of Evangelical Missions in Western Asia," &c., "it cannot, from its constitution, be an auxiliary to the Board." But what does the term *Aid Society* mean, but something like an auxiliary Society? By the way, I would just add, that the American Board has made a wise choice of Mr. Young—a most excellent and intelligent man, and an Englishman—for its advocate; none surely can suspect him of any leaning in favour of slavery.

With regard to the meeting of the American Board of Commissioners at Hartford, and its indorsement of Mr. Treat's letter of 1848, I would just observe that, from their own confession, it is evident, that they long refused to adopt its sentiment, and that when they did so, they acted not spontaneously, or because they thought it was necessarily right,—but under the influence of pressure from without; and they have not yet gone far enough in their practical condemnation of slavery. The merit or praise of what they have done is owing to the exertions of those Societies in America which have separated from it in consequence of its pro-slavery conduct; and therefore the latter deserve our most cordial sympathy and support; and our most earnest wish and prayer are, that God would grant them all the wisdom and power of endurance and courage which they need; and may they soon realise the important object at which they aim. We thank God for the noble spirits which he has raised up in America. They are its glory and defence.

In conclusion, I must express my regret that any misunderstanding should exist between Mr. Vincent and the Committee of the Congregational Union. The gentlemen who compose the latter are most uncompromising opponents of slavery; they abhor it as much as I or Mr. Vincent can do; and I must say I am sorry on account of some expressions which Mr. Vincent has used respecting them, as well as for some that they and others have employed respecting him; and I would very respectfully entreat both to reconsider them, as all are essentially one in their views respecting slavery.

To conclude, I may be permitted to say that I am far from regretting the part which I acted at the meeting of the Congregational Union at Newcastle, while I am still sorry that I found it necessary to oppose, and still to differ from, those whom I highly respect and love. I earnestly recommend to all the perusal of Mr. Vincent's pamphlet. I hope that the agitation, to which his papers have given rise, will do much good—will diffuse knowledge, arouse thought, and that the result may be the taking of another step in the right direction by the American Board of Missions and other Societies in America, and in their joining fully in the holy war against slavery.

# AMERICAN SLAVERY DEFEATED.

## THE AMERICAN BOARD OF MISSIONS AND SLAVERY.

### *To the Congregational Union of England and Wales.*

GENTLEMEN,—In commencing a short series of letters to you, it seems in place to explain why I do so, otherwise it may be deemed an improper act publicly to address a body representing so large a constituency as the Congregational Union does.

At the committee meeting of the Congregational Union in February last, I was introduced, in a very kind manner, by one of the Secretaries, as the representative of the American Reform Tract and Book Society. I was permitted to make a statement respecting its origin and objects; after which I asked the Committee to give the Society the benefit of their recommendation to the churches. The Society was highly spoken of, two exceptions only being taken to it, not important to mention unless called for.\* The Committee, however, did not feel at liberty to grant my request, because "it was contrary to precedent." If they "established one in this case, it might hereafter create some difficulty if not followed in other cases." As "individuals" they might afford some help, and there were three members of the Committee kindly offered to render me assistance. I was satisfied, as I could see the propriety of the refusal.

In May following I was surprised to see that the Rev. C. G. Young was reported to have introduced the subject of missions to Turkey, in connexion with the American Board of Missions, to the Congregational Union, asking the co-operation of the Congregational churches. Mr. Young alluded to the subject of slavery in substance as follows: "If the British churches would assist in this work, he thought it would have the effect to induce the Board to take right action on slavery." A resolution was moved commending this object to the prayers and sympathies of the churches. The seconder of that resolution spoke to the following purpose:†—"I would say *give*, but as to having the effect to produce right action on slavery, it will do no such thing." No one knew this better than he; and he knew, too, that he was uttering the sentiment of every abolitionist in the United States.

The adoption of this resolution has placed the Congregational Union in a most unfavourable position towards the whole religious anti-slavery movement in America. It is a position which I cannot think that they will retain, when the facts are fairly and fully before them. At present they have not the facts, and I dare to say, that the Congregationalists in England have been misled on the subject of slavery in America. I do not say by the rev. gentleman who introduced the American Board of Missions to them, for, if I mistake not, he has himself very little idea of the immense influence that Board has wielded, and is still wielding, on the side of the slave-power. Misrepresentation has been conducted by those visiting England, "who," to use the expression of one of the metropolitan ministers to me, "are very warm anti-slavery men while here, but most unfortunately are never heard of again in that capacity." The Congregationalists have received in good

\* The two exceptions were,—1st, to the article in the constitution of the Society which proposes to apply the principles of the Gospel to *every known sin*. This was thought to be *too wide a field*. 2nd, The Society has published a few tracts on temperance, and this was an objection. It is right, however, to state that both were urged by one member of the Committee, the Rev. T. James, and received the sympathy, and that very limited, of but one other member.

† An error. Mr. Ward did *not* second the resolution, as has been reported, partly through our means; but the expression fell from his lips in some remarks on the next resolution on slavery. We have had several interviews with Mr. Ward, we have spoken with him on this subject, we know his life, his whole course in England, and are assured from his own lips that nothing could have been farther from his thoughts than advocating the support of, or the union with, a Board which he regards, equally with ourselves, as being unworthy of support because of its pro-slavery attachments.

faith what they have said. Probably what has been said has been literally true, but there are "sins of omission," and it is as much a sin to practise deception, by keeping back a part of the truth, as by telling a direct falsehood. The truth may have been spoken, but it has been so spoken as to produce misapprehension. This is the only way in which I can account for the error into which the Congregational Union has been led. Still this does not relieve the Congregational Union much. A precedent could not be established in case of a thoroughly anti-slavery religious Society. This was right. But why one should be so soon established in favour of a pro-slavery Society, I have no means even for conjecturing satisfactorily.

I have not been in America connected with the anti-slavery movement, studying and experiencing the difficulties and opposition thrown in its way, without being able to form some idea of the effect of this action on the anti-slavery cause there. This one act, if not repealed, will abolish all the good you have ever done us. For years, the abolitionists in America have been toiling to separate slavery from the churches, and from religious institutions. Every argument and persuasion have been used, and they have failed. Determined to abolish this connexion, there has been a gradual but increasing secession from these pro-slavery churches, and free churches have been formed. Secession from the pro-slavery societies followed, and free missionary societies were formed. Then followed the American Reform Tract and Book Society, and, I believe, one or two other small free publishing societies. And so the religious anti-slavery movement has progressed, slowly but surely, steadfastly adhering to its leading principle, "No fellowship with slavery." The abolitionists of America have been greatly encouraged and strengthened by the occasional aid and oft-expressed sympathy of the British churches; but the action of the Congregational Union will strengthen the American Board, and with it all the pro-slavery societies and churches. It will impose the greatest hindrance to the abolition movement that it has ever yet had. When we remember that slavery is more dependent upon religious organisations for support than it is upon the National or State Governments, this action is still more alarming in its consequence. By strengthening these pro-slavery institutions, a greater amount of vitality is infused into the whole system of slavery than by any other means. The passage of the Fugitive Slave and the Nebraska Bills was to be regretted, but the effect of them no discerning abolitionist dreads. But the action of the Congregational Union is to be dreaded, because, whatever was the intention of this body, the only use that will be made of it in the United States will be to crush the free church, the free missionary, and the free tract movements. Let this be done, and slavery is secure.

One reason, then, for addressing my letter to the Congregational Union is, to call the attention of that body to facts touching the past and present position of the American Board, and, in behalf of the whole of the religious anti-slavery churches and societies in the United States, to ask them to rescind that resolution commending the American Board, and hold "No fellowship with slavery."

Another reason is, that, in all probability, before this time, the facts to which I have alluded are already in circulation in America. I understand that they have been forwarded for publication. I knew nothing of it until it was too late to stop them; not that I desired to stop them for any other purpose than to know in what shape they went forth,—to produce what impression, and to have some direction of the medium through which they should reach the public. As it is, I know the medium, but nothing more. Seeing, therefore, that the facts are abroad, I wish to have them come from my own pen, that I may be responsible only for my own version.

Lastly, I address my letter to the Congregational Union, because I have found a very general impression among the Congregationalists in England that their—I might say *our*—denomination in America are "the enemies of slavery." I see by referring to the *Anti-slavery Reporter* for December, 1853, a letter from one of the Secretaries of the Congregational Union to the Editor, in which he says: "You probably are not aware of the extent to which the Congregational churches of the United States have committed themselves against the institution of slavery." He then cites the resolution of the Albany convention to prove the anti-slavery character of the body. If it afforded the least testimony to that effect it would be gratifying. In the course of my correspondence I shall be obliged to show the utter worthlessness of that resolution.

In the *Manchester Weekly Advertiser* I also find a letter from "An Independent Minister," dated August 16th, 1854, in which are the following statements. He says: "There are no Independent ministers in these slaveholding States. Their known intolerance of the infamous system of slavery has prevented them from gaining a footing in these centres of its existence. And I may add, on the most unquestionable authority, that the Independent ministers throughout the United States are, to a man, the uncompromising opponents of the accursed system."

This is the general impression among English Congregationalists. I have sometimes feared lest what I have said in my lectures about Non-slaveholding Congregational Churches should have tended to deepen this impression. If it has, I am sorry; for it was contrary to my intention, and is decidedly untrue. I am about to show that Congregationalists in America are the "enemies of slavery" and "the uncompromising opponents of the accursed system" only in the same sense that it is true of the Episcopal Methodists, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, and some other smaller denominations. We need the influence of the Congregational denomination of England with the kindred body in America; but, first of all, they must know what are the facts in relation to them, that their influence may not be lost. I trust the time is approaching when the denominations of England shall clearly understand our church relation to slavery in America, and send across their earnest and well-directed appeals to our denomination there. Before this can be the case, however, all connexion with pro-slavery societies in that country must be dissolved.

Next week I shall give some facts relating to the American Board, to show that that Society is, and has been, terribly involved in the sin of supporting slavery, and consequently is not worthy of the support of any one who desires to see an end of slavery. One thing I ask from the Congregational Union, and from every Christian throughout the land, that is, a hearing.—I have the honour to remain, respectfully yours,

JAMES VINCENT,

Agent of the American Reform Tract and Book Society.

119, Grove Place, Bury New Road, Manchester, Sept. 6th, 1854.

P. S. I have just learned that a delegation from the American Board is expected by the *Niagara* in a few days. They are about to visit the missions of the Board in Hindostan. I trust their stay in England will not be short.

### *To the Congregational Union of England and Wales.*

GENTLEMEN,—In my last I promised to give some facts relating to the American Board of Missions and Slavery. I will now do so.

The American Board of Missions has for many years supported churches among the Cherokees and Choctaws, two Indian nations. These churches have been and now are open to slaveholders. In 1845, the Board reported thirty-five slaveholders in their communion—a most humiliating statement. In 1846, at the annual meeting, the abolitionists as usual brought forward the subject of slavery in these churches, and, "as usual," it was referred to a committee. Instead of recommending the Board to proceed to some action, they reported that "they consider the further agitation of the subject here as calculated injuriously to affect the great cause of missions in which the Board is engaged." So nothing was done in that year. In 1847, the abolitionists again made an effort to bring about direct action, and the spirit of determination then manifested not to be put off as they had been, elicited the promise that one of the Secretaries should visit the missions in question that year, and the whole subject would come up on his report the following year. The Secretaries affirmed that they had every possible disposition to remove slavery, and every other evil and sin, as speedily as possible from the mission churches. This gave the abolition friends ground to hope that now something was about to be done. In 1848, the missions had been visited. The Secretary reported, and to a few facts from that Report I ask your attention.

The Secretary quotes some of the laws of these two nations on slavery, respecting which I will only say, that for wickedness and barbarity they are exceeded by no nation, nor equalled by any saving the United States; yet the Prudential Committee



of the American Board of Missions say of one nation, "they have a *good* government," and of the other, "they have an *excellent* government." It seems fair to presume that the "object" of the Board in sending missionaries there was, to instruct them in the principles of the Gospel. But the religion they teach is manifestly not the religion of Christ. Their teachings resemble those of our slaveholding divines, they are *accommodated to the slave-laws*. The Secretary says, "*the relation of the Christian master to his slaves, either as to its lawfulness or its continuance, has not been disturbed; and little has been said to him calling in question the fundamental principles of the system.*" Again he says, "*It does not seem to have been the aim of the brethren to exert any direct influence, either by their public or their private teachings, upon the system of slavery.*" Hear what the missionaries themselves say: "WE CAN NEVER MAKE IT A TEST OF PIETY, OR CONDITION OF ADMISSION TO THE PRIVILEGES OF THE CHURCH, THAT A CANDIDATE SHOULD EXPRESS A DETERMINATION NOT TO LIVE AND DIE A SLAVEHOLDER." I ask that this may be borne in mind. One other fact,—and I must claim forbearance when I say that the American Board of Missions has employed on those stations men to whom God never gave a commission to preach the Gospel, who ought never to be tolerated on earth, and who, in my opinion, never will be, in heaven. Hear what they say about the separation of families:—"IN RELATION TO THE SEPARATION OF PARENTS AND CHILDREN, WE MUST FIRST REMARK THAT IT IS ONE OF THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE NOT FORBIDDEN BY EXPRESS INJUNCTION OF SCRIPTURE. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE IN OUR CIRCUMSTANCES TO MAKE IT A GENERAL RULE THAT THE SEPARATION OF PARENTS AND CHILDREN BY SALE OR PURCHASE SHALL BE REGARDED AS A DISCIPLINABLE OFFENCE." This is the language of the missionaries of the American Board of Missions. Not only do they show an utter lack of religion, but it would appear that they are also wanting in the common feelings of humanity.

The expectations that the Board had raised, that they were about to cut loose from slavery, were never realised. The impression was, that if the Choctaw missions did not renounce slaveholding, the Board would renounce them. This opinion becoming current, aroused the pro-slavery spirit, and so the Secretaries, instead of reporting that the Board was free from connexion with slavery in that quarter, or that it soon would be, declared that "*the Committee have never had any intention of cutting off the Choctaw Mission, but repeat the expression of their undiminished confidence in the integrity of these servants of Christ.*" Slavery was victorious; the Board, instead of being true, receded and took back the only seeming anti-slavery act it had ever performed. The meeting was reported to have been "harmonious." The South and the pro-slavery journals were in ecstasies, but the friends of humanity, and the only true friends of God, retired to weep and to pray. A member of the delegation to Hindostan declared that it "was the most glorious meeting ever held." So it was, for the triumph of wickedness. It was a "glorious meeting" for the slaveholder and slave-breeder. It "was the most glorious meeting ever held" for the slave-trader, for now he could continue to buy and sell and separate families, and still be a good Christian. And why not?

It "is not forbidden, by express injunction of Scripture,"—so the missionaries tell us. The American Board say they "*have undiminished confidence in these servants of Christ,*" (?) so then they are, the Board and the missionaries, of one heart and one mind, making those heathen tenfold more the children of wrath than they were before. This cannot be denied, for the Secretary says, in his Report, that slavery increases in proportion as civilisation progresses. One proof of this is seen in the fact, that in 1845 there were thirty-five slaveholders connected with the mission churches, while in 1848, according to the Report, there were sixty-two. It is rather a singular fact, that in 1845, the total membership was reported to be eight hundred and forty-three in the churches of the two missions. In 1848, there were eight hundred and seventy-two, showing, that out of an increase of twenty-nine members, in three years, *twenty-seven of them were slaveholders.*

Are we to infer from this, that the preaching of the missionaries tends directly to build up the system? Let one of their own number answer this question. Writing in the fall of 1848, he says, "I am fully convinced that this mission (the Choctaw) must be supported by those who are willing and disposed to give their influence in

the support and in the propagation of slavery in the Christian church. For years past, the Gospel, as brought to bear upon this people, has had an *indirect influence to propagate and build up this system of wrong and oppression*. I am sorry, in justice to truth, to say, *in some respects it has had a direct tendency to it.*"

Here are some of the facts. They are known by every man and woman in the United States who have withdrawn from the American Board of Missions; and the reason that they have withdrawn is, that they will be no party to build up slaveholding churches, nor in any way be identified with them.

The American Board of Missions very well understands the feeling which is fast gaining ground against them. They are suffering in the confidence of the public more and more every year. They need not, if they would do right. In 1848, it is pretty generally understood that they tried a plan which, if it succeeded, would make it appear that they had done right—viz. to obtain a transfer of the mission churches, slaveholders and all, to the Assembly's Board of Missions; but the missionaries would not hear of this, so they had their choice either to retain the missions as they were, or to abolish slaveholding in them, and they chose the former. This has only made it worse for them than before; it was an attempted *evasion*, not repentance and putting away of sin. We have seen how this unworthy scheme failed; we will now look at another artful expedient, not to rid themselves of the odium of tolerating slavery, but to strengthen the whole thing just as it is, in all its iniquity. The American Board happens to have some missions in Turkey. All England is in sympathy with Turkey. Moreover, the English churches are almost entirely ignorant of the facts here presented. If they (the Board) can succeed in beguiling these churches into co-operating with them in augmenting the missions to Turkey, three very important points will be gained. First, but least, these missions will be augmented. Secondly, all the English churches will be in union and communion with the Board, and thus it will acquire strength immeasurably greater than it has lost in the secession of the abolitionists. And thirdly, and chiefly, the whole religious abolition movement can be easily crushed; for, if the English churches are connected with the American Board, they are, to all intents and purposes, connected with the other pro-slavery societies, and with the pro-slavery churches, those "synagogues of Satan," for they are all based upon one principle—"fellowship with slavery," and so the whole secession movement from the churches and societies can be nicely put an end to. This is the great point to be gained by getting the English churches to help to augment the Turkish missions. It is a *Prime* idea, but unless I am greatly mistaken it will have a *Prime* conclusion. There never was a more subtle scheme conceived, and so fatal in its results, if it can only succeed. But it is *not* to succeed. These facts are to be chronicled in every one's memory throughout the kingdom.

We are told that one result of co-operation with the American Board will be "to work in union with our brethren in Christ." Just look at that for one moment. The American Board embraces "the dealers in the bodies and souls of men as brethren in Christ." How are we about to embrace the American Board, without embracing these "dealers in the bodies and souls of men?" Again; the "treasury of this Board is replenished with the price of blood; and the thrice-accursed produce of oppression and wrong, tears and groans, agony and death, is gratefully received by this association of merciful men, and sent abroad to promote the salvation of the Gentiles."\*

Will the English churches embrace or unite with these "dealers in the bodies and souls of men" as their "brethren in Christ?" Will they throw their funds into a "treasury replenished with the price of blood?"

Next week I shall conclude what I have to say upon this subject. I have the honour to remain, gentlemen, respectfully yours,

JAMES VINCENT,  
Agent of the American Reform Tract and Book Society.

119, Grove Place, Bury New Road, Manchester,  
Sept. 14, 1854.

*To the Congregational Union of England and Wales.*

GENTLEMEN,—In my last I spoke of the chief point to be gained by the American Board of Missions by getting the English churches into communion with them. I wish to refer to this again, as I can only look upon the attempt as unequalled in modern atrocity. When our children in America shall read the history of their country, and the dark pages of the struggle of Freedom with Slavery, and shall read of this plot to murder one of the holiest causes in which a man can be engaged, they will execrate the men who laid it.

The evangelisation of Turkey, much as it is to be desired, is, I repeat, the least important point to be gained by the American Board. About seven or eight years since, the American Missionary Association was established by those who had withdrawn from the American Board on account of its connexion with slavery. From that time it has kept up a vigorous agitation, and has been the very soul of the religious anti-slavery movement in America. Besides having both Home and Foreign Missions, it has already two healthy auxiliaries, one in Cincinnati, and the other in Chicago. These promise to wrest the Western churches from the grasp of slavery and of the American Board, that the funds of the West may go only to the support of the Gospel, which is unfettered by slavery. The Report of this Association shows that in 1852 it had an income of 31,000 dollars, and last year it was 42,000 dollars—an unmistakable evidence of the feeling abroad in reference to the American Board—while their missions included the Mendi in Africa, Jamaica, Siam, the Ojibwe missions, Canada, New Mexico, and the Sandwich Islands, besides their Home missions in the West. These Societies, with the American Reform Tract and Book Society, have grown up within the last seven or eight years, and the activity with which they have been conducted is truly marvellous. The results are corresponding. In almost every church throughout the country, as often as a collection is taken for missions, the question comes up: "Which Society shall we support, the anti-slavery or the pro-slavery?" The consequence is, that the anti-slavery Missionary Societies are gaining, and the pro-slavery Societies are losing, the confidence of the churches.

Now, there are but two ways in which this can be stopped. First, by the American Board dissolving their connexion with slavery, and *operating* against it as they profess to do against other sins; or, secondly, by crushing the American Missionary Association, its auxiliaries and kindred societies, by getting the English churches into an association with them. They are trying the latter. They are aware that the English churches have repeatedly uttered their protests against slavery, but have taken them to be of the same worthless nature as their own, and are adopting their present scheme as a test. They have the hardihood (whether with or without encouragement) to send across here to ask the English churches to unite with them in evangelising Turkey; the great end to be accomplished being to re-establish themselves in the confidence of the people, which they have lost by their pro-slavery corruption, and to destroy the Free Missionary, Tract, and Church movements,—then slavery can have free course. Their agents can travel through the country and point to the English Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists, and say to the congregations which they address: "No one doubts their anti-slavery, yet *they* can unite with us." This would be the style of speech used by every agent of that Board throughout the country, and there can be no doubt but it would have the effect for a time greatly to injure the whole of the religious anti-slavery movements.

But while it is to be deeply regretted that such an attempt as this should be made just now, and that it should have been so far successful, there is good to come out of it. The religious anti-slavery churches and societies in America have felt and expressed the utmost confidence in the sincerity of the English churches; but from some cause or causes unknown to them, they have felt that there has been, *of late*, a leaning in England towards our pro-slavery bodies in America. Their confidence has been greatly shaken upon hearing that *pro-slavery ministers have been entertained by English ministers*—that they have been invited to the platforms of benevolent Societies here; and that ministers from the north, who call themselves anti-slavery, but who are known by abolitionists at home only as pro-slavery, that these

*should be received and entertained by English ministers and societies, is a question which we in America feel an interest in inquiring into.* If the churches and ministers here really are approving the course of the pro-slavery bodies there, the anti-slavery churches and ministers greatly desire to know it. If they are not, they desire to know; and if the question of amalgamation with the American Board of Missions shall now determine this matter, even though it be in favour of the pro-slavery bodies, it will be greatly preferable to the uncertainty which now surrounds it.

At present, I am not able to believe it possible that the churches in this country will continue to co-operate with the American Board, and I now ask you to rescind your resolution commending it to your churches. I ask this for the sake of your own body, to preserve it from connexion with slavery. I ask it for the cause of truth, for nothing is more certain than that the churches in England will be represented throughout the United States as favouring the pro-slavery organisations. I ask it for the cause of freedom. Every friend of the slave is watching you, *though not with that unwavering confidence that they once did*; yet, remembering your own struggles in the cause of freedom, and the many expressions of sympathy which you have afforded to them, they cannot now think that you are about to enter the ranks of slaveholders and slavery supporters. The eye, also, of every slaveholding minister, aye, and of every slaveholder, is watching you. They feel that there is at least a possibility that you will decide in their favour, when they remember how successfully they have kept the truth from English ears,—that there is to be found, even in England, a religious weekly newspaper which will speak approvingly of the *New York Observer*, which is read, and even quoted, with satisfaction in the slave States, whose Editor numbers one of the most *shameless renegades to the cause of freedom and of God* among the “great and good,” and who will suppress what is spoken and written in England, revealing the iniquities of the defenders of slavery,—I say, even these slaveholders are not without some hope that the English churches will decide in favour of the American Board of Missions. We ask you, then, not only to rescind your resolution, but in whatever future action you may take on this subject, to give that Society no opportunity to publish abroad that you have even the remotest connexion with them.

It will be understood that I do not esteem missions to Turkey unimportant, though not of greater importance than to other places that I might mention. If, however, the prospects are such as to warrant additional efforts on the part of Christians, it is certainly most gratifying; and if the Episcopalians, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, and the Congregationalists in England and Scotland can unite in a foreign Society to furnish the Gospel to Turkey, they surely can unite at home and establish a Society expressly for the East of Europe and West of Asia. If, however, they feel that this is undesirable, and that they could be doing a good work by aiding a foreign Society, to the amount of two or three thousand pounds annually, more or less, they can still do this through the medium of a purely anti-slavery Society in New York, which has all the necessary apparatus for extending their operations. They have men; they only need the money; and they will furnish to Turkey a class of missionaries who will not teach that “the separation of parents and children,” or any other local or national sin, may be tolerated in the Christian church, simply because “it is not forbidden by direct injunction of Scripture,” as the missionaries of the American Board do. No, but they will furnish missionaries who will preach the Gospel fully and faithfully, applying its principles to *every sin, and especially to those sins which stand most in the way of vital religion in their respective localities*. That Society would not go to Turkey and build up churches which would be worse than Mahomedan, as the American Board goes to the Cherokee and Choctaw nations, and builds up churches worse than heathen, by bringing them under the influence of a Christianity which, as they preach it, upholds a system that includes every conceivable form of iniquity; but they would build up churches which would shed around a pure, a holy influence, gathering into them only those who have renounced their former corruption.

I have mentioned the American Missionary Association, not because I have received authority for so doing, but, knowing it as I do, I have done as I have, in order that the English churches may not be able to say, when they shall find out

what they have done, that they were not aware that there was a Society which was wholly free from connexion with slavery, with which they could unite for the good of Turkey.

Next week I will discuss the position of the Congregational churches in America.—I have the honour to remain, gentlemen, respectfully yours,

JAMES VINCENT,

Agent of the American Reform Tract and Book Society.

119, Grove Place, Bury New Road, Manchester, Sept. 21, 1854.

The following is the reply of the Committee to the foregoing letters:—

It seems necessary to say that, in the correspondence alluded to, Mr. Smith politely informed me that Mr. Young was about to read a paper at the autumnal meetings, on the subject of missions to Turkey. I felt, as Mr. Young represented a pro-slavery Society, that I was justified in asking permission to read a paper on the "Religious influences which afford stability to slavery in America." I often hear it said, and with much truth, that the blunders which are made in England on the anti-slavery question arise from ignorance. My object was to give information, that men and bodies might act understandingly. I would have shown the exact position of our churches and religious societies in America on slavery, and also that it is inconsistent for English churches to be in correspondence or fellowship, or in any way connected with pro-slavery organisations.

Congregational Union of England and Wales,

4, Blomfield-street, Finsbury, Oct. 3rd, 1854.

MY DEAR SIR,—I write this evening to inform you that I placed your printed letters to the Congregational Union, and our correspondence on the subject contained in them, before the Committee to-day. They carefully considered the whole matter, and instructed me to say to you, that, while most happy to welcome you as a visitor to the sessions of our autumnal meetings in Newcastle and the adjoining towns, they cannot be a party to the introduction of the subject of American slavery in the way you proposed; and this would appear unnecessary, even for the promotion of your own object, as you have already furnished our pastors and churches, through the medium of the press, with your views on the subject.

In relation to your wish, that they should dissolve "their connexion" with the American Board of Missions, they are anxious that you should be fully aware of the fact, that they have never had any connexion with it. The resolution adopted in May, for the wording of which not the Committee but I am responsible, makes no mention of the Board, and simply refers to the gratifying details which Mr. Young gave to the Assembly, of the openings for the spread of the Gospel in Turkey, and the success which had attended its proclamation, commending this particular mission only to sympathy and support.

As the paper of Mr. Young, to be read in the present month, will be on that one subject, the Committee decline mixing up any other topic with it. Indeed, very little time can be given to it, as our own business is considerable and urgent.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales has, on all suitable occasions, expressed itself clearly and decidedly on the enormous evil of the law and practice of slavery in the United States of America, and has earnestly appealed to the Christian churches of that land to use their power for its speedy and complete annihilation. This was done at great length by the Union, at its annual meetings, in May, 1853; and, in relation to the Nebraska Bill, it published an earnest resolution in May of the present year. To these documents the Committee would refer you, as the just exposition of their views and actions, and not to any vague inferences which persons may think proper to draw from approval expressed of a statement made in relation to the spread of the Gospel in Turkey.

I have the best means for knowing that the churches comprised in the Congregational Union are decided opponents of slavery, and are anxious to do all that they can, on Christian principles, for its abolition. With kind regards and best wishes, I remain, my dear Sir, yours faithfully,

The Rev. J. Vincent.

G. SMITH.

## ANSWER.

MY DEAR SIR,—The Committee of the Congregational Union have done me the honour to reply to my letters on the American Board of Missions and Slavery. I wish to return them my best thanks, and to express my happiness that they deemed the subject one important to consider. It was not my intention to say anything more on the subject, but I cannot refrain from a short notice of your letter at such an important moment as the present. And allow me, first, to remind you, that no notice whatever is taken of the refusal of the Committee to commend the American Reform Tract and Book Society to the prayers and sympathies of your churches, on the ground that there was no precedent for it, and to make it agree with the act so soon after of establishing one, and that, too, in favour of the American Board of Missions, in respect to their missions in Turkey. The resolution may not mention the American Board, but it means it. Request was made for the Congregational churches to help the American Board to augment their missions in Turkey. It was not asked to send help to these missions independently of the Board, but through it; and the resolution commended the object.

Here, then, are the plain facts of the case, about which every man in England and in America will form his own opinion,—that the Congregational Union, by refusing to establish a precedent in favour of commending a thoroughly religious anti-slavery Society to the churches, and establishing one in favour of commending a notoriously pro-slavery Board, in respect to its mission in Turkey, has placed itself in alliance with the pro-slavery organisations in America, and in opposition to the entire religious anti-slavery movement. This is not all. After having the facts in relation to that Board fully brought to light, first, in an eloquent speech by the Rev. J. B. Walker, in Exeter Hall, on the 24th of May last—but which facts were most discreditably suppressed by the Editor of the *British Banner*—and, again, by myself, in my recent letters to the Congregational Union, which were also used, as the *New York Observer* uses anti-slavery facts, by the same Editor; they have suffered the introduction of a paper at the autumnal meetings, commending the American Board's missions, which are a part of the Board, and have refused to allow the subject of American slavery to be introduced in a paper showing why the Congregational Union should not sustain that Board, or its missions.

The American Board has stifled the cries of freedom, and will not suffer her voice to be heard in its assemblies, and this act of the Congregational Union is a similar indignity to that cause.

With respect to giving support to the particular missions only, let me impress upon you that it cannot be done, any more than nourishment can be conveyed to a particular part of the body, but through the body. The Turkish mission is part of the American Board of Missions, and any support given to that mission must be superintended and directed by that Board. If, then, the Congregational Union is connected with the Turkish mission, they are connected with the American Board; and if with the American Board, then with slaveholders, slave-buyers, slave-sellers, and slave-breeders; in short, they have become the supporters of the entire system of slavery, just as much as is the American Board itself.

As my voice—no, not mine, but freedom's—is to be hushed at your coming meetings, let me make one other remark. It has been told, and probably will be again, that the missionaries in Turkey are good men and women, doing a good work, and therefore your sympathies will be enlisted in their favour. I have nothing to do with men or women in this discussion, neither has the Congregational Union. The missionaries may be all and more than is affirmed of them; but the question is not whether, being good men and women, they shall be supported, and more added to their number, but whether they shall be supported by English churches through the American Board of Missions; that is the question. There are good men among the Roman Catholic priests; but because there are good priests in a particular place doing a good work, would the Congregational Union encourage the raising of funds from their churches for the Papacy to augment that mission? Do you say the Papacy is anti-Christian? So is the American Board. It takes the price of blood. That is anti-Christian. It bows down to slavery, and does its bidding. That is anti-Christian. It sustains men as its missionaries, who

teach that, because the "separation of parents and children is not forbidden by direct injunction of Scripture," therefore they cannot discourage it in their mission churches. That is anti-Christian. It is an anti-Christian institution, and ought to be frowned upon by every friend of God and man.

The proposition which I have offered in my letters is the one with which I will close, namely, that the Congregational Union rescind their resolution commending the Turkish missions of the American Board. I might urge it on many grounds; but will simply say that, to the whole religious anti-slavery movement in America, it is an act of injustice for the Congregational Union to allow it to remain. I might urge it on the ground of consistency. The Congregational Union has stood by the side of those who have seceded from those great pro-slavery organisations and churches, and encouraged them to secede in greater numbers; but for them now to occupy the very places which have been vacated partly by their means, upon the ground of religious principle, is a most intolerable inconsistency.

I would, therefore, again respectfully, but with great earnestness, urge the Congregational Union to rescind that resolution, which is detrimental to the Union itself, and to the whole anti-slavery movement in America. I am, my dear Sir, faithfully yours,

Rev. G. Smith.

JAMES VINCENT.

P.S.—I should like to attend the meetings next week, but as I can accomplish nothing, and having great demands upon my time, I must decline attending.

---

The following letter from the Rev. C. G. Young appeared in the *Patriot*, October 12, 1854:—

*To the Congregational Union of England and Wales.*

GENTLEMEN,—I should not thus publicly have ventured to address you, had not Mr. James Vincent, agent of the American Reform Book and Tract Society, addressed to you three letters, under the title "The American Board of Missions and Slavery," the object of which is to destroy the confidence so generally felt in this country towards the Board, and to crush the incipient movement on behalf of the Armenians and Greeks in Turkey, represented by the "Western Asia Missions' Aid Society." Before replying to Mr. Vincent's extraordinary charges, so far as they affect this Society, I judged it best to wait until he had stated all that he had to say; but having seen a third letter, which appeared in the *Manchester Examiner*, containing even more absurd charges and implications than the others, it seems needless longer to delay. I do not feel called upon to be the apologist of the American Board, much less to reply *seriatim* to his reckless charges against the Board, which, whether false or true, have no natural or necessary connexion with the action of *British* Christians on behalf of Turkey.

As regards the Congregational Union, to which Mr. Vincent is pleased to address so many urgent remonstrances against what he styles its recent act of amalgamation with the American Board, I need scarcely remind you, that you have pronounced, in no measured terms, against the sin and shame of slavery, as is most evident from your resolution in May, 1853; and certainly there is nothing in the resolution which you passed last May, commending the subject of Turkish missions to the sympathies of the churches, which could warrant such implications as Mr. Vincent has made. The fact that this resolution was seconded by one of the most uncompromising abolitionists, is evidence enough to any candid mind that it was certainly not of a nature to compromise the Union or the churches; yet the burden of Mr. Vincent's letters, from first to last, is, that an amalgamation has thus been formed with the American Board—that the Board is seriously implicated in the support of slavery; and that, by a most cunning stroke of policy, it has inveigled the British churches into the support of pro-slavery institutions, through this missionary movement on behalf of Turkey. "This one act of the Congregational Union will," he says, "abolish all the good you have ever done.\* . . . The whole abolition movement will be easily crushed." The simple reply to all this is,

\* Mr. Young should be fair, and quote correctly. "All the good that you have ever done," and "have ever done *us*," are very different statements. *Us* refers to the religious anti-slavery societies and churches.—AUTHOR.

that both the averments and the implications derived from them are *utterly without foundation*.

As regards the Congregational Union, the premise being wrong, so must be the conclusion. The Union is in no way committed to support the American Board, but has simply commended to the churches the Western Asia missions, which happen to be mainly under the superintendence of American missionaries.

As regards the Western Asia Missions' Aid Society, or, as its title is in full, the "Association in Aid of Evangelical Missions in Western Asia and the East of Europe, especially those of the American Board," it cannot from its constitution be an *auxiliary* to the Board. It is stated, in the preliminary paper issued by the Committee, that "the missions established by the American Board appear entitled to the largest share of support, as being extended over a much wider field than any other, embracing European Turkey and Asia Minor, Syria and Mesopotamia, Armenia and Kurdistan, and as having been successfully prosecuted where no other Protestant missions exist;" and further on, "The Society is not pledged to confine its aid to those missions, for its general principle is to encourage all who preach the Gospel in its purity and truth, and in a sincerely evangelical spirit." Should the state of the funds admit, the Society is free to aid Episcopal, or Methodist, or Baptist missionaries, as well as Congregationalists and Presbyterians, and Germans as well as Americans. This catholic and cosmopolitan feature in the constitution of the Society is one of its chief characteristics. Nothing can, therefore, be more unfair or ridiculous than to denounce this effort on behalf of Turkey as calculated to promote slavery. There are names on the Committee which should satisfy all unprejudiced persons on this score.

But the most serious charge in these letters, equally affecting the Board and the Western Asia Missions' Aid Society, is the unworthy and most false insinuation in the second letter, that this is "another artful expedient of the Board, not to rid themselves of the odium of tolerating slavery, but to strengthen the whole thing, just as it is, in all its iniquity;" that "there never was a more subtle scheme conceived, and so fatal in its results, if it can only succeed;" and in the third letter, that "this attempt is unequalled in modern atrocity;" "a plot to murder one of the holiest causes in which man can be engaged."

I know not how far Mr. Vincent is actuated by political bias in his anti-slavery crusade, or what motives chiefly actuate him; but I must say, that if he writes thus in ignorance of the facts, he is most culpable for thus giving palpable shape to his own distorted imaginations; while, if he writes in cognisance of the facts, he is chargeable with the grossest slander. I can only suppose that in this case passion and prejudice have overborne his better judgment and sense of truth.

The Western Asia missions' movement was purely spontaneous, originating in British minds and on British soil. The American Board knew nothing of what was proposed until the subject was mentioned to their Secretaries, by two individuals who had taken a deep interest for many years in the missions in Turkey; and one of these was the honoured treasurer of the London Missionary Society. The field of labour among the Greeks in Turkey had been brought before the notice of the Committee of the London Missionary Society, and it was not until they declined to enter it that the present movement began to assume its present form. Christian brethren, of various denominations, became interested in the subject, until it was decided to form an Aid Society, like that which has existed so many years in aid of Moravian missions, and also like the Foreign Aid and Evangelical Continental Societies.

As regards the other charges against the American Board, I can only say, that if any candid person will read, fairly and fully, the Reports of the Board for 1845 and 1848, on the subject of slavery among the Choctaw and Cherokee Indians, I am much mistaken if the conclusion arrived at does not differ widely from that of Mr. Vincent. The Report adopted at the annual meeting of the Board at Brooklyn, in 1845, speaks of "the wickedness of the system" of slavery, the "unrighteousness of the principles on which the whole system is based, and the violation of the natural rights of man, the debasement, wickedness, and misery it involves, and which are, in fact, witnessed to a greater or less extent wherever it exists;" and, in the letter of the Prudential Committee to the Choctaw mission, after the meeting at Boston in 1848, are these words:—"Denying, as we do, that there can be,



morally and scripturally, any right of property in any human being, unless it be in consequence of crime, and holding that the slave is always to be treated as a man, we suppose that whatever is done in plain and obvious contravention of these doctrines may properly receive the notice of yourselves and your sessions. . . . Is it too much to ask, may not these churches soon be freed from all participation in a system that is so contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, and so regardless of the rights of man? . . . Most ardently do we pray that the whole nation may be delivered from this tremendous evil.”—(*Report of A. B. C. F. M.*, 1848, p. 109.)—Is this the language of a pro-slavery Society?

The only real point of controversy between the Board and any evangelical portion of the anti-slavery body, is the relation of the Cherokee and Choctaw missions to slavery. In order to appreciate the position of the Board in relation to these missions, it is necessary to bear in mind that its principle is to allow much independence of action to all the missions—more, perhaps, than is the practice with Missionary Societies in Britain. If the missionaries see marks of faith in their converts which satisfy them of their claim to be baptized, and to sit at the Lord’s table, the Board, as a missionary institution, does not feel justified in *enforcing* any opinions that it may hold, considering that the missionaries on the spot are the proper judges of the sufficiency of the evidence. The missions among the Choctaws and Cherokees were commenced thirty-five years ago, long before the anti-slavery agitation in the United States. The present missionaries found slavery in existence, on their arrival, as a national institution; they found some slaveholders in membership, and have received others, who appeared to them to give credible evidence of piety. The missionaries feel themselves placed in a most trying and painful position. They are not citizens; the laws of the tribes denounce abolition; they are surrounded almost by white slave-owners, many of whom have contracted marriages with the Indians, and do all in their power to maintain the system of slavery. Still, the missionaries hope, that, by preaching the Gospel fully and freely, to bond and to free, and using such other means as are permitted by the laws of the tribes and the jealousy of the planters, they may be enabled gradually to infuse the spirit of Christianity into the institutions of these nations, so that the slaves shall become all free men, as God has enabled the mission of the American Board, in the Sandwich Islands, to liberate the whole people there from one of the worst kinds of slavery. The members of the Choctaw mission speak of slavery as “an enormous evil.” The Board appears to apprehend that the slave-power may, after all, prove too strong for them; but so long as the missionaries can, with a good conscience, remain, they believe that it is their duty to do so, lest, by their withdrawal, slavery and other deadly evils should maintain a greater hold.

I think that I have said enough to show how unfounded are Mr. Vincent’s charges against the American Board. The strongest testimony against slavery could be compiled from their official documents. Their Difection is as free from the contamination and guilt of slavery as is that of the London Missionary Society; and so is the body constituting the Board, that meets from year to year. The subscription list shows what a trifling sum comes from the States in which slavery exists; and I am assured that it is not known that any of this is contributed by the holders of slaves.

In his first letter, Mr. Vincent does not state correctly what I said at the Spring Meeting of the Congregational Union. I said, in substance,—“If the British churches would assist in this work, I believed it would have the effect to induce the churches in the United States, that have hitherto deferred to the slave-power, to consider more dispassionately the British view of the case, as to the inconsistent, and, as we think, unworthy position in which so many of them are placed.” I did not refer to the Board. I might have entered more into detail, if I felt called upon to defend the American Board. I *was* called upon to show how foolishly and falsely the British movement on behalf of missions in Western Asia has been charged with complicity in the slavery of North America. And I now leave it with you to judge whether one, who is so guilty of false-witness in this case, can be a competent witness in respect to the American Board of Missions. Surely, the more desperate and deadly the evil against which we contend, the more need is there that, in our crusade, we be girded with the panoply of *truth* and *charity*. When slavery falls, (and may

that happy day soon arrive!) it will be a triumph, not of political agitation or hot-headed controversy, but of the glorious Gospel of the blessed God.

I beg to remain, gentlemen, faithfully yours,

CUTHBERT G. YOUNG,

Secretary of the Western Asia Missions' Aid Society.

7, Adam-street, Strand, London, Oct. 4, 1854.

We sent to Mr. Young an invitation to meet us in public discussion in Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham, or London, as he had publicly stated that our charges against the Board were "unfounded," and that we were a "false witness." The Editor of the *Patriot* did not insert this. Mr. Young, however, in a reply to a written communication, declined the invitation.

While preparing our pamphlet for the press, we were quite surprised to find how completely our averments were borne out by facts. Mr. Young says that the Western Missions' Aid Society "cannot, from its constitution, be an *auxiliary* to the Board." We say, with all possible respect to Mr. Young, that it is so understood. In the prospectus issued by Mr. Young, under the heading "What can we do?" it is said, "A truly evangelical Missionary Society is already working in this field, has all the necessary apparatus at work, and is capable of extension, viz. :—

"THE AMERICAN BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS. *It is proposed, therefore, to aid and supplement the Turkish missions of the Board.*"

We are not particular as to the term "auxiliary;" all we contend for is, that it is proposed for the English churches to "aid and supplement the Turkish missions of the American Board;" and Sir Culling Eardley says, that this mission is only a branch of a much larger movement for the combination of the friends of missions. Sir Culling Eardley, then, calls it part of a "combination." Mr. Young calls it a "supplement," or an "Aid Society." What it is *called* matters little; it is *practically* an auxiliary to the American Board. But we will take the American Board's own view of the case. In relation to this movement in England they passed resolutions at their last meeting, in which they say, that they "regard this action of British Christians as a valuable expression of fraternal confidence and regard;" and "that, in accepting this aid and trust, the Board pledge themselves not only to the faithful use of these transatlantic contributions to their best discretion, but also to a deeper interest in the churches and missions of Great Britain."

We would here just refer to our reply to the Secretary of the Congregational Union, in answer to his statement that the May resolution of the Union commended the particular (Turkish) mission only. We said, "The Turkish mission is a part of the American Board of Missions, and any support given to that mission must be superintended and directed by that Board;" and now it comes out that such is *actually the understanding*—the Board "pledge themselves to the faithful use of these transatlantic contributions." If this is not being auxiliary, we have yet to learn what an auxiliary is. And will not the Committee of the Congregational Union see that the American Board *understood* that they were about to be identified with them, though they had signified to Mr. Young that they could not be?

We hope that the following discussion, with its results, will prove to the American Board that the Congregational Union has not confidence in them, and will not have, so long as their slavery relations continue.

We will only add one other action of the Board at Hartford, which we exceedingly regret, and hope that it is not regarded with approbation by the distinguished gentlemen in England who are immediately concerned. We mean that the Earl of Shaftesbury, Sir Edward Buxton, and the Hon. Arthur Kinnaird, together with the Rev. C. G. Young, were elected corresponding members of that Board.\* We most earnestly hope that such a relationship will be of short duration.

---

\* "British Banner," November 1st, 1854.

## DISCUSSION ON SLAVERY AT NEWCASTLE.

It is now time to notice the effect produced by the foregoing letters. This will be best seen by a perusal of the discussion which arose after the reading of a paper on Turkish missions, by Rev. C. G. Young, at the Autumnal Meetings of the Union, held in Newcastle :—

## TURKISH MISSIONS.

The Rev. CUTHBERT YOUNG read a paper on the subject of Protestant missions in Turkey.

The Rev. G. D. CULLEN, of Leith, proposed the following resolution :—

"That this Assembly tenders to the Rev. George Cuthbert Young, B.A., the expression of its thanks for the valuable and deeply interesting paper he has now read on 'The openings for the Gospel in Turkey,' and requests that he will place it at the disposal of the Committee. That a recommendation of the claims of the 'Turkish mission' by a vote of the last Annual Assembly of the Union having given rise to an apprehension, on the part of some persons, to the effect, that the Congregational Union of England and Wales look with a degree of tolerance and favour on the slavery of the United States of America, in consequence of the supposed\* implication of many of the Christian organisations of that country in the evil of slavery, this Assembly deems it right to repeat its emphatic condemnation of the law and practice of slavery as existing in the United States, and to declare its undeviating adherence to the sentiments of the Union, as expressed in its resolution on the subject of slavery, adopted by the Annual Assembly of 1853, and its determination to carry out, as far as possible, the resolves it contains."

He said he had lately heard Mr. Kelly say, in an anniversary sermon, that the romance of missions had ceased. He (Mr. Cullen) believed there was never so much romance connected with them as at the present time. In Turkey especially, there had been one of the most marvellous and sudden manifestations of Divine truth that the world had witnessed for ages. (Hear, hear.) The American Board of Missions had sent out men to occupy the field; and, in spite of much opposition, they had held fast their ground, and the Lord had owned and blessed their labours. The churches in this country were called upon to co-operate with their brethren in the United States in sustaining missions so prosperous and useful, in applying their funds to support a native agency, which the American Board would put under English direction, if Christians in this country would assist them in taking possession of the land. He rejoiced to think that Mohammedanism had received a blow more dreadful than it had ever before experienced—not on the heights of Alma, but in the firman which the Sultan had published, by which he confiscated a large portion of the land that had hitherto supported the religion of the country. With such facilities to advance, if the Christians of this country neglected to enter the field they were verily guilty in the matter. (Hear, hear.) Lord Stratford de Redcliffe had stated, that he could use his influence in behalf of American missionaries in a way which he could not adopt with regard to his own countrymen, owing to the jealousy of other European powers. This was one of the many circumstances which should induce English Christians heartily to co-operate in the work.

The Rev. Dr. STOWELL seconded the resolution.

The Rev. WALTER SCOTT:—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the paper which has been read, and no one can rejoice more than I do at the efforts which are now being made to evangelise Turkey; at the same time, I must own that I cannot suffer this motion to pass without entering a strong protest against it. I am sensible of my own insignificance when compared with many of the brethren who support this cause; but I think I see so clearly, and I feel so deeply, on this subject, that if I stood alone I would enter my protest against the resolution which has been proposed. You have not been told that the American Board of Missions is connected in various ways with slavery, that they have slave churches, and that they hold doctrines which, in my apprehension, are quite subversive of the principles of the New Testament. They maintain, in some places, that because it is not expressly said in Scripture that children must not be taken

\* Why say "supposed," when the Committee knew that these organisations were implicated in slavery?

from their parents, therefore there is no sin in tearing the children of slaves from them, and sending them to distant localities. In my apprehension, America is the stronghold of slavery; if it could be abolished there, it would soon be abolished throughout the world; and yet, I am sorry to say, that professed Christians in America are, in my view, the chief strength of that stronghold (Hear, hear.) I have no doubt whatever, that if all the Christians in America would come forward and perform their duty in protesting against slavery, it would soon be abolished there, and throughout the world. I must own, that the part which American Christians and churches are acting with regard to slavery, is, in my view, one of the most melancholy and appalling spectacles that can be presented to us. I hardly wonder, sometimes, that there is so much objection to religion with some of the anti-slavery Societies. We hear of the infidel sentiments of some of the supporters of these Societies. I really do not much wonder at any man contemplating the religion of Jesus Christ through the medium of the practices which exist in America, even among members of churches, being inclined to infidelity. I can hardly help thinking, that if I had known nothing more about Christianity than what I could learn from such practices, I should almost be an infidel myself; but, I thank God, I know it better in another way. Now, no one can rejoice more heartily than I do in the progress which is made in evangelising Turkey, and I pray that the American missionaries may be more and more successful; but this is a very different thing from our connecting ourselves in any way with the American Board of Missions. (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN:—Allow me just to call your attention to one thing,—that in this resolution there is no recommendation to the Union whatever to adopt these missions. It contains simply a vote of thanks to Mr. Young for his paper, and then a condemnation of American slavery.

Mr. SCOTT:—I fully perceive that, but *actions speak louder than words.* (Loud cheers.) *I have no doubt that many of the supporters of the American Board will use as strong expressions against slavery as any of us can do; but if they do not come forward in their pulpits and other places, and speak against slavery—if they do not join those Societies which seek its abolition—I think they are really supporting it by their actions.* (Applause.) I do not know what I should do if I were in America; but, with my present views, I think that, without exposing myself to unnecessary danger, I should not be shackled in expressing my abhorrence of slavery, even if I had to supplicate the Almighty to give me grace sufficient to die for it. (Applause.) I feel deeply on this subject, and I should greatly regret if any pecuniary assistance were given to the American Board. Before you make up your minds on this subject, let me advise you to read the papers which have been published by Mr. Vincent—the agent, I believe, of the American Reform Tract and Book Society. (Hear, hear.) I knew something of the matter before, but those papers fully convince me that the American Board of Missions is deeply implicated in the subject of slavery. I believe that what they are now doing is *in order to recover lost ground.* Another Society has been formed, entirely free from slavery; it has caused the American Board to lose ground, and they have, I believe, got up this movement among British Christians in order to recover their lost credit. (Hear, hear.) You know very well that if you were to publish a very good book that they would wish to read and circulate, they would take care to expunge from it every sentence against slavery. They have done this with many works of English writers.

Dr. MASSIE here rose to order.

Mr. SCOTT: Allow me just another minute. (Cheers.) I advise you to read Mr. Vincent's papers. I think, if we do anything for Turkish missions, we should do it directly through the medium of the London Missionary Society. (Applause.) I would do all in my power to evangelise Turkey, *but I hate slavery!* (Applause.) I was born with an instinctive hatred to it. I well remember, when I was a boy, reading about it, and then about Cæsar and Alexander; and I used to wish that I was an Alexander or a Cæsar, with a large army under my control, so that I might go and abolish slavery everywhere. (Applause and laughter.) And I don't know but what I should do so now, if I had it in my power. (Laughter.) I cannot, then, suffer this resolution to pass without entering my decided protest against it.

The Rev. Dr. MASSIE: I think our friend Mr. Scott has not a stronger hatred to

slavery than is entertained by the Committee who drew up that resolution. We actually communicated with Mr. Young, to the effect that his paper could in no way identify us with the Board of Missions in America. In no way does this resolution pledge you to support them. (Hear hear.) If it did, I would second Mr. Scott's protest. I am quite prepared to stand by the principles that he has advanced in reference to the American churches; but in passing this resolution, we only thank Mr. Young for the information he has given us. He could not give us that information without telling us who are the agents that have carried on the work; he leaves us to think of those agents, and the Society that supports them, just as we please. We ourselves accept his information with thankfulness, and we proceed, in the most emphatic manner, to repeat our denunciation of the horrid crime of the American churches who are identified in any way with slavery. We say that we wash our hands clean of all connexion with them. I think with Mr. Scott, that if we could get up an organisation to support an agency of our own in Turkey, even if it be only one man, it would be our duty to do so. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. THOS. JAMES: It ought not to be lost sight of, that our assistance is not asked for the American Board of Missions, but for the support of a *native agency*—an agency as free from slavery as Mr. Walter Scott is. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. SCOTT: It was stated, in the paper, that the matter was in connexion with the American Board of Missions. There is one thing I wish to say, and that is, that Mr. Vincent, to whom I have referred, wished to read a paper on the opposite side, but *that permission was not granted to him*. With all due respect to the Union, I do not think that was fair play. If I had had anything to do with the matter, I should have advocated the reading of both papers.

Mr. SMITH: I will meet that in the most candid way. I have invited Mr. Vincent to be here. I have entreated him to come, and assured him that he should have the fullest and fairest opportunity of discussing the whole matter. He wanted, however, an entire hour to bring up the whole question of slavery, and the Committee did not think that we wanted that question again gone into. We have very important business in relation to our Union, and we did not want the slavery question to be taken up in that full way; but we are thoroughly prepared to abide by the resolutions brought forward by Mr. Baldwin Brown in 1853. I do think that we can pass the resolution without committing ourselves in any way in reference to the American Board of Missions. If the brethren think otherwise, the resolution can be withdrawn; but then, if you withdraw it, you withdraw your emphatic condemnation of the evil of slavery.

The CHAIRMAN: The first part of this resolution is a vote of thanks to Mr. Cuthbert Young, for the information he has given us; and the second part is a reiteration of our sentiments so admirably expressed by Mr. Baldwin Brown in his resolutions of 1853; and I never heard resolutions more definitely condemning all American slavery and the churches connected with it. Are you not prepared to reiterate those sentiments? I think we should stultify ourselves if we set them aside. There is, as it seems to me, not one sentence or word in this resolution which in any way connects you with the American Board. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. J. G. ROGERS: I do not object to the thanks of this assembly being presented to Mr. Young for his paper, nor do I object to the latter part of the resolution; and yet, strange as it may seem, I cannot give my vote in favour of the motion before us, simply for this reason,—that while the resolution expresses nothing more than a condemnation of slavery, *by your thanks to Mr. Young you will be considered by the advocates of the American Board to sympathise with them, and in some measure co-operate with them in their work*. (Hear, hear.) Now, Sir, I feel, that the work going on in Turkey is one, the importance of which we can scarcely exaggerate; and it is a great pity that we should seem to throw even a temporary discountenance upon the labours of earnest, good men there; but *I do not think that we can tacitly or avowedly support that mission without implicating ourselves more or less in the support which the American Board has given to the practice of slavery*. (Applause.) About a year ago, in Bradford, we were almost prepared to pass a resolution of thanks to Mrs. Stowe, for that admirable book in which she attacked slavery; and I think we ought now to shrink from anything which would in any way commit ourselves to the support of slavery, or which might, in the most distant way, be considered by the advocates of that institution

as a departure from our own principles. (Applause.) Mr. Smith has said, that if we withdraw the resolution, we withdraw our protest against slavery. I cannot agree with that. I do not think that we require at each meeting to renew the vote which we passed in 1853. (Hear, hear.) Is it to be understood that this question of slavery is to be renewed every year, or else that we withdraw our protest? Surely not. Our views on slavery are distinct and clear; and let us not, *by any equivocal actions*, cause our friends to think that we have forgotten our principles, or deserted our flag. (Applause.)

Mr. CULLEN: I should be sorry for the presentation of such a resolution as this to produce division in this assembly, as it would then do more harm than good to the cause which we wish to serve. We are all one in our abhorrence of American slavery. If there is a man in the country who feels more strongly than another on the subject, it is the man on your right hand (Mr. Smith). I can remember how he introduced the matter when we were speaking of other things, and I am sure I would second him in all that he said. I sympathise with all my heart in what my friend Mr. Scott has said, and with this feeling I think it would be better to withdraw the resolution. (Loud applause.)

Dr. STOWELL consented, and the resolution was accordingly withdrawn.

Mr. YOUNG said, that almost every statement of Mr. Vincent's was without foundation, and that a reply to his letters had appeared in the *Patriot*.

---

This is just the action that might have been anticipated. Such was our knowledge of the Congregationalists, after all our intercourse with them in different parts of England during the last ten months, that we were confident no resolution which sought, even in the remotest degree, to identify English churches with the pro-slavery churches or organisations of America, could pass that body when once they were made acquainted with the facts. We confess that we were not prepared for any such a demonstration; our only fear was, that the facts had not been spread far enough to be productive of much good. We had done our duty; we had given publicity to them through the medium of four newspapers, widely circulated among Congregationalists, besides sending our facts in another form, by hundreds of copies, by private letter. All having been done that we could do, we left the event in the hands of God; and we see how perfectly He has accomplished His own work. It is a mistake to suppose that God uses those instruments which are most popular with man for bringing about His purposes. God sees not as man sees. "He hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are, that no flesh should glory in His presence."

The Congregational Union have, in driving the American Board from their doors, only acted under the immediate and direct influence of the Spirit of God, which is the spirit of truth, which is the spirit of unconquerable hostility to slavery in every form. We would most earnestly beg of the entire Union, and the ministers and members of all other denominations, to keep a vigilant watch, and resolutely to refuse to co-operate in any enterprise, however laudable in itself, with which the American Board of Missions, or any other of the pro-slavery Societies, are in the remotest degree connected. And further, we say to the churches, look for slavery in those enterprises which are presented to you from abroad, which appear most inviting, most urgent, and which address themselves most to your sympathies. You may look at them, you may turn them inside out, you may shake them, and decide there is no slavery there. But there is. Coiled away under some seam lies a "native agency," or some other form of this monster. We say then, *Have nothing to do with anything, which has anybody connected with it, whose connexion with slavery can by any possibility be traced in the State or the Church.*

With the results of this discussion the *British Banner* is greatly displeased:—

"Nothing occurred in the course of the Session requiring particular remark, except the resolution touching slavery. In relation to this, Professor Scott, of Airedale College, greatly distinguished himself by a vehement speech against the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions. The Rev. George Smith, by whom the resolution was penned, on behalf of the Committee of the Union, is second to no man in either hemisphere

In his intense and enlightened abhorrence of slavery; and in this he is the meet embodiment of the Committee of the Union itself. Nothing was further from his or their intention than, in any manner, or in any degree, to uphold the American Board in anything adverse to the cause of human liberty, or savouring of the slightest complacency in the dark deeds of the planters. A close examination of the resolution will absolutely demonstrate the truth of our allegation. Its object was simply to encourage and fortify Mr. Cuthbert Young in his philanthropic movement on behalf of Turkey. Professor Scott, however, assumed that their object was to fortify the American Board; and so completely was the Assembly carried away by a torrent of eloquent and most unfeigned indignation, that the mover and the seconder, in the excitement of the moment, proposed to withdraw the resolution; and it was withdrawn accordingly, amid the cheers of the Assembly, giving to Professor Scott the appearance of a triumph on behalf of liberty, and subjecting the Committee to a species of defeat, as having failed to accomplish their reprehensible purpose,—adding another to the cases, already too numerous, of the danger of giving way to temporary excitement. A very slight measure of calm and candid consideration would have shown that Mr. Scott's assumptions were entirely without foundation, and that he and the Committee were completely as one. Mr. Cullen, one of the Scottish deputation, gave his concurrence on the ground of peace,—peace purchased at the expense of truth, reason, and common sense. But with such a man as Professor Scott there was no danger of war; nothing was wanted but explanation to have carried the resolution unanimously. The Professor's complaint relative to Mr. Vincent was not well grounded. That gentleman's treatment by the Committee of the Union was anything but unjust. If it erred, the error was wholly on the side of kindness. Mr. Vincent made a demand to which he had no right whatever, and which the Rev. G. Smith, in the exuberance of his generosity, granted. Hence arose the mischief: the principle of the demand was conceded—the measure of it denied; the measure was confounded with the principle; because much was accorded, it was assumed that he was entitled to all he asked,—and because he got it not, he is proclaimed an injured man! We unhesitatingly submit that Mr. Vincent had no right whatever to be heard in the Assembly, and that his statement would have been nothing short of an intrusion and an interference with the legitimate business of the Session. Our submission goes still further; we hold that Mr. Cuthbert Young had no right. The question of Turkish missions, in our view, was wholly foreign to the work for which the Union was assembled. To say his case was very important was simply to say what, with equal truth, might have been affirmed on behalf of Mr. Vincent—and not of him only, but of the representatives of a multitude of enterprises which might be named—all having for their object the furtherance of the interests of the human family. Had Mr. Scott's views been carried, half the Session might have been consumed with American slavery. He said:—“There is one thing I wish to say, and that is, that Mr. Vincent, to whom I have referred, wished to read a paper on the opposite side, but that permission was not granted to him. With all due deference to the Union, I do not think that was fair play. If I had had anything to do with the matter, I should have advocated the reading of *both papers*.”

“It was well that the excellent Professor had no more to ‘do with the matter,’ else confusion would have been worse confounded. Before Mr. Vincent's arrival in this country, an endeavour had been made by correspondence to enlist the good offices of the *British Banner* on behalf of his forthcoming mission to England. On his advent we showed him kindness, and, on the strength of the testimonies he brought us, we published a paragraph in his favour; but there we stopped. We felt constrained resolutely to refuse insertion to his letters addressed to the Congregational Union, considering it our duty to know more both of the man and of his mission, before we incurred the responsibility of allowing him, in our columns, from week to week, directly to harangue a great Christian community—a mode of address essentially fraught with great influence for evil or for good; and we have only been confirmed by time and circumstances in the soundness of the views we have taken.”\*

The Editor says that the resolution was simply “to encourage and fortify Mr. Cuthbert Young in his philanthropic movement in behalf of Turkey.” Why did not the Committee, so far as they could, fortify and encourage Mr. Vincent in his philanthropic movement on behalf of three millions and a half of slaves held in chattel bondage, who not only have not the Gospel, but by law are denied its blessings?

The *Banner* says that the resolution was “withdrawn amid the cheers of the Assembly, giving to Professor Scott the appearance of a triumph on behalf of liberty.” The “*appearance*!” If the *British Banner* does not know better, other people do; and the demonstration not only had the *appearance* of a triumph, but it *was one*, and a *glorious one*. We repeat our belief that the Committee were right in not thus fortifying this movement, because there existed no precedent for it; the evil lay in establishing a precedent so soon after, which would, in the hands of that Board and its agents, have acted most prejudicially to the religious anti-slavery movement in America, and also to the Congregational Union itself, by giving them the opportunity to publish abroad that the Union favoured their conservative and corrupt policy, rather than the course of the anti-slavery churches and societies, which thing is not true.

The Editor says, “Mr. Vincent made a demand to which he had no right whatever; and which the Rev. G. Smith, in the exuberance of his generosity, granted.” The *British Banner* is wholly in error. In the first place, Mr. Vincent had a right to be heard as well as Mr. Young; and it was not till he was informed that Mr. Young was about to read a paper, that he asked leave to read one. Secondly, Mr. Smith

\* Our remarks on this paragraph will be found in the Appendix.

made an unguarded statement, which, with all the correspondence on the subject, immediately follow, for the reader to judge how far the statement is corroborated by evidence.

Mr. Smith said, "I have invited Mr. Viuent to be here. I have entreated him to come, and assured him that he should have the fullest and fairest opportunity of discussing the whole matter."

In reply to a letter of the 9th September, 1854, calling attention to the series of letters to the Congregational Union, Mr. Smith says, "Can you come to our Autumnal Meetings of the Union, at Newcastle, October 16th, and following days? We shall be happy to see you, and give you a warm anti-slavery greeting." Again, in reply to a letter dated September 12th, he says, after stating that Mr. Young is about to read a paper on the subject of missions to Turkey, "I think it most important that, if you can, you will attend our meetings at Newcastle." This is all. Next followed the letter asking permission to read a paper on "The Religious Influences which afford stability to Slavery in America;" to which Mr. Smith replies: "Mr. Young's paper will, I am sure, contain no eulogy of the American Board, but be confined to Turkey; and I do not therefore think that our Committee will allow of the introduction of a paper that might lead to controversy. If Mr. Young should say anything justifying slavery, you would be heard in reply; nay, a hundred voices would as readily be lifted up as your own against that enormity." Then followed the official reply, which will be found at length on page 14; but with respect to this particular question it contains only the following:—"While most happy to welcome you as a visitor to the sessions of our Autumnal Meetings at Newcastle and the adjoining towns, they (the Committee) cannot be a party to the introduction of the subject of American slavery in the way you propose."

Here, then, is every word that has been received from Mr. Smith touching this particular thing, from which it is not possible to construct the assurance that the fullest and fairest opportunity would be furnished us for discussing the whole subject. Mr. Smith committed an error. He had a right to; but, as he has suffered that error to remain uncorrected, no one can object to the publication of the facts just as they stand. Far be it from us, in so doing, to wish to produce an unfavourable impression. We believe that Mr. Smith was satisfied, at the time, that he had given us this assurance; still, we think that he should have corrected a mistake like this.

We regret that our correspondence has appeared to any one to imply censure of the Congregational Union. We wrote our letters upon the supposition that the Union held themselves responsible for the actions of the Committee. As we had a ground of complaint against the Committee, and not knowing how far their acts would be sanctioned by the Union, we do not know how we could well avoid appearing to find occasion against the Union, when we were calling in question the acts of their Committee. But we were particularly careful to guard against conveying the impression that the Union had taken a position from which they would not recede. At the very outset we met this, and said, "It is a position which we cannot think that they will retain, when the facts are fairly and fully before them." Here we not only expressed our confidence in the Union, but also in the Committee, in the main; for we supposed that most of them were in ignorance of the facts, while we were constrained to believe that such was not the case with all. After the meeting of the Union, whether we have done justice to the Congregational Union we are willing to be judged by any one perusing these pages. We do not know how, in the use of language, we could express our entire satisfaction clearer. We believe that there never was a body of men, in any part of the world, who acquitted themselves more honourably than they did at Newcastle; and as to feeling grateful to find an occasion against them, we feel only too happy to find that we were right in our judgment, that when they were in possession of the facts, they were the last men to sanction the least concession to slavery, whether it came to them in the form of an angel of light, or in its own natural appearance.

While we feel that we have honourably acquitted ourselves, we feel bound to throw back the slander of injustice to the Congregational Union upon those who originated it, and to say, that they have not only done an injustice to the Congregational Union, but have grossly insulted that body, by declaring that the resolution at Newcastle "was put down by clamour." Are sentiments such as were uttered by Professor Scott and Rev. J. G. Rogers likely to make an assembly of ministers



and laymen, such as was there convened, *clamorous*? Or, worse still, as the *British Banner* intimates, that they purchased peace by sacrificing "truth, reason, and common sense?" We will leave it with the Congregational Union to be the judge, as to where injustice is chargeable.

### THE AMERICAN BOARD AND ITS SLAVERY RELATIONS.

We will now give a brief history of the American Board, in respect to its slavery relations.

It has been always customary for the students of Oberlin College to hold class prayer-meetings of their own. At one of them, in 1836, it was stated that the American Board had actually *bought* slaves with its funds; and this matter was immediately inquired into, and such appropriations stopped. Next, it was ascertained that one of the missionaries, Mr. Wilson, was a *slaveholder*. This was also agitated, and resulted favourably. Then the Cherokee and Choctaw mission churches were reported to be intimately connected with slavery. This was made the subject of inquiry, after years of growing agitation; and, in 1848, Mr. Treat, one of the Secretaries, visited the missions in question. On his return, he made his report. The missions of each of the nations, the Cherokee and Choctaw, forwarded to the Prudential Committee a letter, expressive of their views. These two letters, with the Secretary's report, were considered by the Prudential Committee, and then followed the celebrated Treat letter to these churches. Now, let it be remarked, that this letter was *not* adopted by the Board, and from that year till the present it has been refused adoption. The reason is, that it was too anti-slavery *on its face*. President Blanchard proposed the following resolutions, (see Report, 1848):—

"Resolved, That this Board distinctly admits and affirms the principle that slaveholding is a practice which is not to be allowed in the Christian church.

"Resolved, That it is, in the judgment of the Board, the duty of our missionaries in the Cherokee and Choctaw nations to discontinue the practice of hiring slaves of their owners to do the work of the missions; and, in the reception of members, to act on the principle laid down by Mr. Treat and the Prudential Committee, that slaveholding is *prima facie* evidence against the piety of candidates applying for admission to the church."

These resolutions were "contemptuously" rejected; the chairman announced that they would not be allowed to appear in the minutes; and it was not until Dr. Beecher insisted that they should be placed there, that they were allowed to appear. He said, "If the word go abroad from this meeting that the Board declines to entertain such propositions as these, he could assure them there would be *trouble in the camp*."

Passing over the years of agitation, from 1848 to 1854, we will now, before examining this Treat letter, look at what is said to have given rise to the discussion, previously to its adoption. It appears that the Choctaw nation have recently passed the following enactments:—

"No slave, nor the children of slaves, shall be taught to read or write in or at any school or academy in the nation, by any person whomsoever, or connected in any manner whatever, either as superintendent, missionary, teacher, farmer, matron, pupil, or otherwise, with any school or academy in the nation, under pain of dismissal from such school and removal out of the nation, in case the person offending is not a citizen of the Choctaw nation.

"It shall be the duty of the General Superintendent and Trustees of schools, to be vigilant in the performance of their functions, and promptly remove, or report to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for removal, according to the nature of the contract between the Choctaw nation and the different Boards of missions having charge of public schools and academies; and all persons who may be connected therewith, who is or are known to be abolitionists, or who disseminate or attempt to disseminate, directly or indirectly, abolition doctrines, or any other fanatical sentiments, which, in their opinion, are dangerous to the peace and safety of the Choctaw people."

These enactments are bad enough, but we submit that they are no worse than other enactments by the same nation. Let the reader compare the following enactments, which Mr. Treat tells us have been in force since 1836, and say, if they are not as bad, or even worse; yet the Prudential Committee, knowing this, said of this nation, they have "an *excellent* government."

"*Be it enacted, &c.*, That from and after the passage of this Act, if any citizen of the United States, acting as a missionary, or a preacher, or whatever his occupation may be, is found to take an active part in favouring the principles and notions of the most fatal and destructive doctrines of abolitionism, he shall be compelled to leave the nation and for ever stay out of it.

\* This is entirely erroneous, as President Blanchard has doubtless discovered before this. No such a principle is laid down in the letter; but the contrary is true: provision is made for the reception of slaveholders into the Christian church.

"Be it further enacted, &c., That teaching slaves how to read, to write, or to sing, in meeting-houses or schools, or any open place, without the consent of the owner, or allowing them to sit at table with him, shall be sufficient ground to convict persons of favouring the principles and notions of abolitionism."

Here are abominable laws, which have been in existence since 1836, and no fault is found with them, the Committee even calling the government *excellent*, "defective sometimes in *phraseology*, but for the most part commendable in its aim and spirit."

Now, if any one likes to believe that the laws first stated, which are recently enacted, have caused such commotion in the American Board, of course they will use their own pleasure; but for ourselves, we believe no such a thing. Had the Choctaws passed no laws, nothing could have prevented the question of slavery coming up at the last meeting, notwithstanding it has been a burked question since 1848. The immense power of public sentiment, before which thrones totter, and Boards give way, was such as to demand some action to preserve existence. Its supporters have been drafting off, year after year, until things had come to such a pass that there was evidently the greatest alarm felt for the safety of the Board. Let the reader mark well the following discussion, and see if the action which the Board has taken has resulted from sound principle. The resolutions presented to the Board come first, then the discussion upon them.

"Resolved, That the Board acknowledge with gratitude to God the wisdom and fidelity with which the Prudential Committee [so far as appears from the documents that have been submitted to them] are advising and directing the missionaries among the Choctaws, in conformity with the principles asserted by them in their correspondence with those missions, reported to the Board in 1848.

"Resolved, That the decision of the Prudential Committee, with the concurrence of the missionaries, not to conduct the boarding-school in the Choctaw mission in conformity with the principles prescribed by the recent legislation of the Choctaw Council, meets the cordial approbation of the Board.

"Resolved, That the commission given by Christ to his disciples to go and teach all nations, and to preach the Gospel to every creature, which is the warrant of Christian missions, is to be respected and obeyed in all the operations and by all the missionaries of this Board; and that while our missionaries among the Choctaws are allowed in fact to preach the Gospel to all persons, of whatever complexion or condition, as they have opportunity, and to preach it in all its applications to human character and duty, they are to continue patiently in their work."

We omit the attempts made to lay these resolutions on the table, &c., and make some extracts from the remarks of the speakers:—

Chancellor WALWORTH, in objecting to the report and resolutions, remarked that the report had incorrectly stated that the law had changed the former practice as to teaching slave children, and also stated that slave children *might* be taught elsewhere than in the public schools, which would render interference with the law unnecessary.

Rev. Dr. DWIGHT and Mr. TREAT insisted that the law forbids such teaching elsewhere.

Mr. WALWORTH continued: The difficulty is, that the Board is now called on to endorse an opinion which they have heretofore refused to endorse (that of Mr. Treat's letter of 1848); and that it is called on to endorse sundry letters, without its being known what they are (letters of the Prudential Committee). The resolutions will eventuate in removing the missions. That had better be done by express methods.

Mr. BARSTOW moved that the report of the Committee be adopted.

Mr. TREAT.—The missionaries have established no schools for blacks, but have now and then taught coloured persons, as opportunity afforded. The law is intended to stop this. Slaves would not be allowed to be taught, for instance, in the mission churches. The report might be altered so as to remove the difficulty.

Rev. Dr. BACON would relate a fact elucidatory of these Choctaw laws. There has been difficulty as to the employment of slaves by the mission. It is right, in many cases, to employ the slave of another, treating him as a freeman. But on account of scruples, the mission has been admonished to be careful on this matter; but such employment has been found indispensable. Slaves so employed have been taught. *This* the law is intended to stop; for no *slave* is a member of the Choctaw National Schools. This is the meaning of the law (applause)—that slaves shall not be taught to read the Bible. I am willing to omit from the report all but the narration of the case. No man in the Board ought to object to the passage of the resolutions. The Committee, re-elected for six years, have long held the positions of the letter and the resolutions. The Board has approved them. The contrary is not true. Ground should now be taken openly. Such open assertion should not be shunned, to retain either patronage or contributions.

**Rev. Dr. TYLER**, of Connecticut.—A little mutual concession will restore the harmony of the last five or six years. But I recommend no retrocession. The resolutions are unnecessary. If they are unobjectionable, why not omit them, to accommodate "weaker brethren?" The objections to the report would be removed by omitting them. We should not now be required to endorse this letter (Mr. Treat's), which was refused endorsement before. I beg this concession for peace sake. I move that the resolutions be stricken out.

**Rev. W. W. PATTON**.—This striking out is like asking a minister to strike out his closing remarks.

**Rev. Dr. COX**, and several others.—That might be a good thing.

**Rev. Dr. POMROY**.—The feeling of the whole body of ministers and churches supporting the Board is such as imperatively to require the passage of the resolutions, notwithstanding any possible disagreements here.

**Rev. Dr. LYMAN BEECHER**.—I have lived at the West twenty years. There has been a steady growth of confidence there in the Board. But they want to know definitely the opinions of the Board. If you don't answer the question you will have no more influence beyond the mountains. And this is the last chance.

**Rev. Dr. ADAMS** read a resolution referring the whole business to the Prudential Committee.

**Rev. Dr. SMITH** moved an amendment to the first resolution, endorsing the action of the Committee, so far as known or completed.

**Rev. Dr. TODD**.—I also regret the introduction of the resolutions. But since they are here, sent by Divine Providence, they had better be met. At the last meeting of the General Association of Massachusetts it became evident that this question would come up at this meeting; and Massachusetts demands, at least, the passage of the first resolution.

**President STURTEVANT**, of Illinois, gave reasons for retaining the resolutions. The question should now be put on the basis of right. And further, North-western churches are beginning to distrust the Board on account of its action, or non-action, on slavery. This action can only be defended on the ground that they have in substance endorsed the principles of the letter of 1848. And it is answered that they have not indorsed them. Now, therefore, specific and clear action is desirable. The resolutions should also be retained as an integral part of the expression of the moral unity of the occasion.

**Mr. PATTON**.—The present action of this Board is to go out to the people at large for criticism. It ought to define its position clearly and openly, fairly and frankly. Such definitions are called for by the public opinion of the free States, at least. Ecclesiastical bodies are commending the Board on the ground of their expectation of such a definition. It is the duty of the Board, before God and man, clearly to define its position, and to take that position on the side of truth and righteousness. The passage of the resolutions will rejoice and encourage many all over the North.

**Rev. Dr. RIDDLE**.—It was decided by the Board in 1848 not to endorse Mr. Treat's letter. It is now sought to obtain such an endorsement. A vote supporting the letter, in 1848, would have much harmed the Board. Now, obtained under the pressure and bias of the existing excitement on slavery, it is inexpedient. It will drive off those who are as honest as we are in assisting the operations of the Board.

The **Rev. Mr. REED**, of Virginia, thought that the Choctaws had simply exercised an undoubted right, and that the Board ought not to interfere.

"It was to be expected, of course, that the representatives in the Board, of places where the same kind of legislation is the law, should resist any expression that would go to show the humanity of the down-trodden children of Africa. And who so suitable for such a work as **Rev. Dr. Reed**, of Virginia, where **Mrs. Douglass** and her daughter were recently imprisoned for teaching free coloured children to read the Bible!"

By a vote of 58 to 19 the recommitment was refused. **Dr. SMITH's** amendment was then adopted, and afterwards the report and resolutions.

Now, will any one pretend to affirm that the Board got on to the ground of Mr. Treat's letter out of regard to *absolute righteousness*? It is sounded abroad that the above resolutions were adopted by a large vote. So they were, but the Board were *obliged* to adopt them, and it was nothing less than sheer compulsion. A cordial vote,

indeed! It would not appear from Dr. Pomroy's remarks that there was much cordiality. He said, that "the feeling of the whole body of ministers and churches was such as IMPERATIVELY to require the passage of the resolutions, notwithstanding any possible disagreements here." There were "disagreements," then, according to Dr. Pomroy; and it is as clear as the sun at noon-day, that those resolutions were carried from sheer force outside the Board. "*Massachusetts demands, at least, the passage of the first resolution.*" If they did not carry them they were in peril of existence. Dr. Bacon said, "the views of those who furnish our funds must guide our action." There it is;—a most abominable sentiment, but it is the *principle of the Board*. When slaveholders furnish most funds, *their* views must guide the Board. This is clear.

The *New York Evening Post* has been furnished with a list of the contributions, for the last year, from the several States and territories of the Union; from which it appears, that the fourteen slave States contributed but about *one thirty-fourth* of the income of the Board. Yet the South has always controlled the Board. Massachusetts alone contributes eleven times as much as all the slave States; New York nearly nine times as much—little Connecticut itself five times as much! The largest contribution from any slave State (Maryland) is about half as much as the smallest free State (Rhode Island). The following table of contributions from the several States speaks for itself:—

Free States.			Slave States.		
	Dollars.			Dollars.	
Maine	7,815		Delaware	455	
N. Hampshire	13,225		Maryland	1,520	
Vermont	13,372		Virginia	1,466	
Massachusetts	90,564		Missouri	1,013	
Connecticut	41,128		Louisiana	584	
Rhode Island	2,600		Mississippi	10	
New York	70,667		Alabama	102	
New Jersey	9,573		Georgia	681	
Pennsylvania	10,084		South Carolina	598	
Ohio	12,278		North Carolina	92	
Indiana	2,316		Tennessee	954	
Illinois	4,444		Kentucky	87	
Michigan	3,288		Florida	*1,012	
Wisconsin	722		Texas	109	
Iowa	563				
California	210				
Minnesota	5				
Oregon	72				
TOTAL . . Dollars 283,694			Total . . Dollars	8,630	
			* By legacy . . Dollars	1,007	

## THE TREAT LETTER.

Now we will look at this celebrated Treat letter, which is said to be so anti-slavery. Without taking up our space with anti-slavery quotations from that document, we will readily admit that there is a great deal which, viewed apart from the whole, is as strongly anti-slavery as could be desired. But here is the fact which is to be proved; that letter speaks two languages—the anti-slavery and the slavery. In the first place, it endorses the Brooklyn Report, which contains two general principles. 1st. "The ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper cannot be scripturally and rightfully denied to those converts who give credible evidence of piety; and, 2ndly, The missionaries in connexion with the churches (if any) which they have gathered, are the sole judges of the sufficiency of this evidence." Now, call to mind the declaration of sentiments of these missionaries, that because the separation of parents and children by sale and purchase is not forbidden by direct injunction of Scripture, therefore they could not make such offences disciplinable in their churches; and is it not most evident that, in the hands of such missionaries, notwithstanding all the anti-slavery *show*, this very letter, which has caused such a sensation, has left the mission churches just as they were?—for the Treat letter was written after these infamous sentiments of the missionaries were known. Nothing can be more manifest. We are told that this letter has been the basis of action of the Prudential Committee since 1848. Then, of course, the Cherokee and Choctaw mission churches have been conducted on the principles of that letter. But has there been any decrease of slavery or slaveholding in those churches all this time? Have any slaveholders been disciplined, or led to give up their slaves? Have

the missionaries been directed to a different course to that which they had before pursued? To these questions we answer, No, there has been no change in those churches, so far as appears from the evidence of the Board, notwithstanding they have been conducted upon the principles of Mr. Treat's letter. If, then, this be the result for the last six years, what reason have we for supposing that the mere adoption of that letter by the Board now, will produce any different results hereafter? The principles of the letter are unchanged, and so will be the action of the missionaries. They will not discipline members for selling children from their parents, and this letter does not enjoin it. The missionaries think it right to receive slaveholders into their churches, and this letter, so far from forbidding it, *fully concedes* the right of slaveholders to fellowship in the Christian church. Mr. Treat, at the close of his introduction—and not of the “document,” as the *British Banner* affirms—propounds four topics for discussion. 1. The preaching of the Gospel. 2. The instruction given to slaveholding converts. 3. The admission of this class of persons to the church. 4. The treatment they receive in the church. The second, third, and fourth topics concede that brute-makers, those who trample God's image in the dust, rob men of their humanity, and hold the bones, sinews, flesh, blood, and spirit of their fellow-man as their property, *can be converted* and still retain this relationship, that they have a right to be received into fellowship in the Christian church, and make provision for them.

Discipline is *not* advised for making men into brutes or pieces of property, but only for “overt” acts; in other words, these slaveholding converts are disciplinable only for palpable ill-usage of these “brutes.” Now, the *New York Independent* supposes that this letter, which allows these brute-makers in the Christian church at all, under any circumstances, will be satisfactory: It is evidently deluded with this idea, and says, “Henceforth there can arise no question between the Board and the anti-slavery sentiment of the Christian public;” and adds, “so far as the Board is concerned, all agitation of this subject, both in the Board and out of it, is at an end.” No, it is not. Agitation is to be conducted until the Board shall declare it impossible for any slaveholder, under any circumstances, to be eligible for church membership; it is to be continued until the Board *refuses to receive the funds of slaveholders into their treasury*, and until they shall declare it impossible for a slaveholder, under any circumstances, to be a member of the Board. Until all this is done agitation will not cease, the *Independent*, to the contrary, notwithstanding.

It is evident, then, that the Treat letter is *anything* but satisfactory, and that agitation is to continue. In our opinion, it is a pro-slavery document for all practical purposes.

It is a singular fact, that this document is full of anti-slavery *sentiment*, and this is perhaps its worst feature. By reading it attentively, concessions are found which are sufficient for the slaveholder, and which destroy its effect as an anti-slavery instrument. We contend that this letter will in no way or manner affect the mission churches, to purge them from that corruption which is now in them, even if it be acted upon by the missionaries; for the simple reason, that the letter *concedes the right of slaveholders to fellowship in the Christian church*. No instrument can ever be effective against slavery, which contains the slightest concessions to it.

Concession to slavery is what makes Dr. Bacon, the senior editor of the *Independent*, so impotent, nay worse, one of the strongest backers-up of slavery that there is in the United States. Sometimes he will write as if he were bent on the destruction of the system, and those unaccustomed to his writings would, without hesitation, pronounce him a firm and uncompromising opponent of slavery. His work on slavery is a perfect focus-pocus, full of anti-slavery *sentiment*, but containing concessions enough to satisfy every slaveholder, from St. Clair to Haley and Legree.

In his work he condemns slavery, but defends the relationship of master and slave; the fact that men are held as *chattels*, and are robbed of their humanity, is not a sufficient ground of complaint in his estimation; on the contrary, a slave who has nothing more to complain of than that he is held as a slave, subject to the will of a master, under the most barbarous of all systems, is a “shiftless vagabond.” Hear him. “An anonymous friend,” says he, “who writes to me from New York, says, ‘At this moment I am called upon to aid a poor fugitive with his wife and five children, who have escaped the mere relation (*i. e.* who had no cruelty to complain of, but merely that he was deprived of the right and title to himself, his wife, and

children), having arrived from Virginia last evening. As this is a case of frequent occurrence, will Dr. Bacon please indicate my duty?" To which Dr. Bacon replies, "If a fugitive, with his wife and five children, were to come to me with the confession that he had run away from the *mere relation* of servitude, and not from an unkind, oppressive, or unchristian *treatment* on the part of his master, and should ask me to help him with money, I should probably esteem *that* fugitive a shiftless vagabond; I should tell him that, by his own showing, he had no occasion to run away, and that if he had expressed a reasonable desire to emigrate to some other country, his master would doubtless have put him in the way of helping himself, instead of depending on charity; and I should probably reserve my sympathy and my aid for those fugitives who run away from actual and specific oppression."

Dr. Bacon, then, does not consider the chattelizing of a man, levelling him with the brute, as *oppression*; but only *cruelty* to the "brute," administered with the cow-hide and other means, is oppression in his mind.

Such a sentiment as the above is sufficient to stamp his work. He may denounce slavery in the abstract as much as he pleases, but while there is the concession that the *mere relation* is justifiable in all or any circumstances where cruelty does not exist, is enough. Every slaveholder will claim that the *mere relation* is justifiable in his case; as to cruelty, he would spurn the charge, for he punishes only at his *discretion*, even though every time the lash strikes the slave, his life's-blood streams from his body. 'Tis these concessions which support the system, and it is this feature of Mr. Treat's letter which renders it altogether useless for any practical purposes in driving slavery from the mission churches.

It is difficult to conceive of a more lamentable state of things than is presented by the American Board. Its policy is most unscriptural, not only in regard to slavery, but other sins also. For instance, in those parts of the world where caste has prevailed, instead of requiring that it be renounced as one evidence of conversion, they have suffered its introduction into their churches, under the plea of abolishing it when in the church.

In other places where polygamy has prevailed, instead of requiring polygamists to conform to the spirit and life of the Gospel before entering the Christian church, they have allowed polygamists in their churches for the same reason that they did the adherents to caste. It is this spirit of compromise with, or concession to, caste, polygamy, slavery, and other gross violations of Scripture precept, that has occasioned the American Board so many losses both of its supporters and missionaries.

We will introduce but one other example of the *policy* of the American Board, which is ably set forth by Rev. H. Peck, Professor of Oberlin College, in his sermon before the American Missionary Association, September 28th, 1853.

He says, in speaking of the Syracuse convention:—"When it was proved at that convention, by reference to the instructions given by the Prudential Committee (of the American Board) to missionaries set apart to labour among the oriental churches—instructions which charged its servants to make no assault on the rites and ceremonies which the very missionaries thus charged have described as being 'grossly idolatrous,' and as consisting in part of homage to the image of the immaculate mother of God; and when it was further proved, by reference to documents showing that the Committee had refused to allow missionaries to organise churches for the shelter and culture of converts in the East, who dared not subject themselves to the perverting influences which abounded in their national churches; I say, when it was proved in this way that the Board was disposed to reduce its conservative theory to constant practice, the majority of those present (at the Syracuse convention) felt that they could no longer fraternise with the Society, though they had fondly loved it."

Let the moral intention of the Board be what it might, as Professor Peck remarks, "it was the *policy itself* to which the convention objected; and they evidently felt that if they were *sure* that the policy originated in a pure intention, they were not at liberty to uphold it. Since that time, the Board have in practice abandoned their conservative policy with regard to those missions, and set up churches for the enfolding of converts from the dead forms of the Greek and other oriental churches; but whether or not this change was brought about by the pressure of a disaffection with its course, which cost the Board the loss of at least one of its excellent missionaries, is not for me to say."

No doubt but it was; and where that Board would have been, and what it would have done by this time, if it had not been for the "pressure of disaffection," it is impossible to imagine.

### SECRET DIPLOMACY.

It is time for us to state our foundation for our charge against the American Board, that this attempt to connect the English churches with the Board is "another artful expedient;" and we would first of all invite serious attention to the following, which we clip from the *Anti-Slavery Advocate* for October:—

"The liberal portion of the British press has performed an important part in driving clerical men-stealers and their apologists from the British pulpit. But an intimate, though somewhat private fraternisation, has for some years existed between the peculiar missionary bodies of England and those of the United States. Slaveholders control the latter organisations, and as self-protection in their pro-slavery crimes requires them to control the public feeling of England, it is not surprising that they should employ the missionary machinery for so base a purpose."

This is valuable only so far as borne out by evidence, and without knowing what evidence the *Advocate* possesses, we shall proceed to give what, to our mind, is satisfactory evidence enough that there is a great deal that is wrong, and needs to be and *must* be set right. What evidence have we that there has been a secret diplomacy conducted?

Last February we were in company with the Rev. Thomas James, who informed us that he had had, if we mistake not, a slaveholding minister—at all events, a slaveholder—for his guest. For how long we did not, of course, inquire; it might have been an hour, a day, or a week; but it was evident enough that he had had sufficient intercourse with him to be made into a *very careful man*. He pleaded with much earnestness that some slaveholders do much for their slaves, that some masters would gladly be free from the relation, and a great deal more. Now, we hope that we are always willing to do justice; we know of one or two cases of painful interest ourselves; but we contend that, when speaking of the system, they should *never be named*, and, when devising means for its abolition, *never thought of*. It is nonsense for men to talk about not being *able* to free their slaves; where there is a will there is a way. As to a slaveholder doing much for his slaves; *what business has he with slaves at all?* And yet here is Mr. James, tempered down to the slavery standard, making all sorts of apologies and excuses for all sorts of slaveholders, and condemning slavery only in the abstract. If Mr. James chooses to entertain slaveholders, no one has a right to prevent him; but we believe that it is a proper question whether, being the Secretary of a Missionary Society, he should be the apologist of the slaveholders.

Again—Sir Culling Eardley, in his speech at the Evangelical Alliance in May last, in alluding to the Turkish mission, said that this "Mission was the branch of a much larger movement for the combination of the friends of missions. He had been assured, by the Secretary of the American missions, that a contribution of £5 towards those missions would draw out the American more towards the mother-country than anything else." Were it not that Sir Culling Eardley is the treasurer of the London Missionary Society, we should not refer to his speech so pointedly. What we are doing is, to show that there is sufficient ground for the people and churches insisting upon a close investigation as to the nature and extent of the correspondence, whether verbal or written, between the officers of the Missionary Societies in England and the United States. This combination of missions sounds very well; but let the people look after it. The American Board is included in the combination. We are told that the project originated in England. Very well; but is it not the result of this private fraternisation? A deeper-laid scheme could not well be imagined, nor so likely to succeed, as a secret diplomatic agency. There was a time when Judas would have shuddered at the thought of betraying his Master; but the chief priests, and scribes, and the elders of the people consulted how they might take Jesus by *subtlety*. They succeeded. Now we do not, for a moment, pretend to say that these English gentlemen have *intended* to deliver the churches and societies here into any connexion with slavery, or into any position where it can be asserted of them that they are so connected. Judas was wrong

to be conferring privately with the enemies of his Master; and these gentlemen ought not to be in private correspondence, or even on intimate or friendly terms, with those who are the supporters or apologists of the accursed system of slavery, much less should there be concert of action with them. The man who will venture to open his lips to sustain it, or in any sense apologise for it, should be put away from our houses and families; and no man who will shelter, or protect, or apologise, or plead for the system or its friends in any way, should be allowed to remain in the service of a Missionary Society. Such men will be Judases. They will compromise, then betray.

We submit that there should be no combinations of missions. Those Societies already in existence are quite large enough for their purity and the public safety. These combinations are dangerous, and should be discountenanced; especially should no alliance be formed with a Society which has the remotest connexion with slavery.

We have one more fact which, perhaps, might come more appropriately under another head, but we will place it here, as it is intended to show that there is a great deal that is wrong which needs to be set right. A straw thrown into a river will indicate its course, and these signs are significant.

When we were making our arrangements for carrying on the work which had been entrusted to us, we were advised to ask the co-operation of the Rev. J. H. Hinton, as he holds the office of Secretary to the Baptist Missionary Union. We asked the favour of his name to our circular; but because the American Reform Tract and Book Society had published a few tracts on temperance, and would on peace, purity, and other reforms, "by opposing to sin the principles of the Gospel," he declined to afford the Society any help; would not commend it to the Baptist body, for the reason that (notwithstanding the Society is intended to conduct its operations mainly against the system of *slavery*) he was "neither a tee-totaller nor a member of a Peace Society." We were not a little surprised, and could not account for such conduct, as we knew that there were Baptists throughout the country who, though neither tee-totallers nor members of a Peace Society, would nevertheless gladly aid an Association designed to undermine the system of American slavery. While we submit our own case to the Baptists as a body, and ask, will they retain a man in their service, who, for such a reason as the above, will shut the door of the whole Connexion against the religious anti-slavery body in America? we will give yet another fact which has come to our notice with respect to the treatment of another gentleman who represented an anti-slavery Missionary Society in America, of the Baptist denomination, which treatment we feel was worse than that in our own case. We cannot do better than take the facts as published in a letter in the *British Banner*, June 8th, 1853, from a letter by Mr. Chesson, the Secretary of the Peace Conference in Manchester, and who filled the office of Secretary to the last Anti-slavery Conference in that city with great ability.

Mr. Chesson states of the American Baptist Free Missionary Society, that "this Association, throughout its whole history, has been uncompromising; or, as Dr. Belcher says, 'rabid' in its abolitionism, and has, in fact, adopted the very advice given by the Baptist Union in several of its addresses to the Baptists of America. And yet, notwithstanding these facts—and I hold myself ready to prove them to be facts—the Baptist Union has studiously refrained from addressing to this anti-slavery Society one solitary word of friendly recognition; and in answer to the communications of its agent, the Rev. Edward Matthews, the Executive Committee, through their Secretary, the Rev. J. H. Hinton—from whom, considering his antecedents, I expected better things—refused to have anything to do with him, or the Society whose representative he is, and this, too, without preferring any charge against the one or the other." Speaking again of the Baptist Union, Mr. Chesson says: "At its last meeting, not one word of warning was addressed to the Baptists, who have attained to the dark distinction of being the most stalwart supporters of Southern oppression." These statements were not answered. From this it will appear, that the whole body of Christians of this denomination, who have acted in accordance with the very advice given by the Baptist Union, when they come here in the person of their representative, have the door shut in their faces. Is this how the Baptists of England feel towards the Baptists in America, who for the love of God and for the honour of His cause have separated themselves from all connexion with slavery? We unhesitatingly declare, from our own knowledge of that body, it



is *not*. But the Rev. J. H. Hinton, their servant, has thus dealt with them, and we earnestly suggest to the Baptists throughout England, in some public, emphatic manner to have an explanation, and have some security that they shall not, by any such acts hereafter, by their Secretary, be made to appear to their brethren abroad as hypocrites and untrue.

We leave these statements here, with the confidence that the Baptists in England will seek some mode of remedying this state of things.

### WHAT SHALL BE DONE?

Under the foregoing head we think that we have adduced sufficient evidence to prove that the state of things, in relation to the officers of our Missionary Societies, is such as to demand public attention, or the people may be betrayed into the hands of slaveholders before they are aware of it. We recommend that every minister, Independent and Baptist, throughout England, shall resolutely require the officers of those Societies who have been in private correspondence with the slavery-tolerating Societies in America, or with slaveholders, or with slaveholders' apologists—1st, to vacate their offices; or, 2nd, that they give the most complete and satisfactory assurance that all such correspondence and intercourse, both public and private, has ceased; and that so long as slavery is in any sense tolerated by any Society, or members of a Society, in America, so long they will refuse to receive them or their representatives into their pulpits, or to their platforms, or into their houses, or in any way to tolerate those who would raise an objection, here or elsewhere, to sit at meat with the blackest man that God ever made. This is drawing the line tight, but no tighter than the churches in England as a body draw it; and let this be done, let them demand that those in their service shall be like unto them in this matter, then and not till then will they be safe from being betrayed into the hands of slavery.

We think that we have sufficiently defended our position that the endeavour of the American Board is an "artful expedient;" if conducting a traitorous scheme under cover of fraternal correspondence and friendly intercourse may be called "artful." We will leave the reader to judge of this.

### CONCLUSION.

We address ourselves to the ministers, deacons, and churches throughout England. One noble act has just been put forth by the Congregational Union; now follow it up, and on all future occasions, if your Committees will introduce men on to your platforms who are connected directly or indirectly with slavery-tolerating Societies, insist upon their leaving those platforms. These are the acts which will tell with mighty force; one such *act* is worth a volume of resolutions. Let the platforms of the Congregational Union, the London, Church, Baptist, and other Missionary Societies be cleared of the accursed thing. Let the Bible and Tract Societies, and the Sunday School Union, and kindred Societies be free also; or if the Committees will introduce those who are connected with the slavery-tolerating Societies in America, the people should do *their* duty and demand their withdrawal.

In order that it may be known which Societies are tolerating, and which are free, the principal ones here follow:—

#### *Slavery Tolerating.*

- The American Bible Society.
- The American Board of Foreign Missions.
- The American Home Missionary Society.
- The American Tract Society.
- The American Sunday School Union.
- The Presbyterian Board of Publication.
- The Methodist Book Concern.

#### *Anti-slavery.*

- The American Missionary Association.
- The Western Home and Foreign Missionary Society.
- The North Western Home Missionary Society.
- The American Baptist Free Missionary Society.
- The American Reform Tract and Book Society.

## APPENDIX.

Two or three topics, which would have been out of place to introduce in the foregoing pages, are here inserted. They are important, and attention to them is earnestly invited. They consist of our concluding letter to the Congregational Union on the *Congregationalists in America and Slavery*; the settlement of an account between ourselves and the *British Banner*; two leaders from the *Morning Advertiser*; the editorial of the *New York Independent* of Oct. 5th, on the "Vote of the Choctaw Question;" concluding with a brief account of the American Reform Tract and Book Society. To each and to all of the above the reader's attention is particularly invited.

### THE CONGREGATIONALISTS IN AMERICA AND SLAVERY.

*To the Congregational Union of England and Wales.*

GENTLEMEN,—It is true that quite a large and a very influential portion of the American Congregationalists are the most thorough promoters of the anti-slavery cause, religiously and politically—indeed, their politics are guided by their religion. What I have to do now, is justice. It is not right for the American Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians, to be continually censured for their support of slavery, and, if not in so many words, yet in effect, to be pointed to the Congregationalists for an example how to act on this subject, when they know that this denomination is no more free from the support of slavery than themselves. There is really very little difference in their position; for, while some hold slaves, others support them in it, and lend their influence to the great system. With respect to the resolutions of the Congregationalists, they prove nothing more of the great body than do those of the other denominations. The fact is, that branches of all of the denominations have condemned slavery in the most unmeasured terms; but the difficulty is, that they do not carry out the principles embodied in the resolutions. They condemn it, but still hold fellowship with it and vote for it. The Congregationalists never passed a stronger resolution against slavery, than did the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in 1818; but no man of common sense would think of quoting that to prove the anti-slavery character of that body, simply because their practice conflicts with the principles there laid down. In these days people get tired of resolutions, and value them only as they are carried out. There are some resolutions which never could be carried out, because it is not known what they mean. One class of persons vote for them with the understanding that they mean one thing, and another at the same time vote for them supposing that they mean another; hence it is impossible to use them for any purpose, and they stand as mementos of the weakness of the bodies that adopted them. An opportunity occurs occasionally which fully proves this assertion. For instance, the resolution of the Albany convention has been thought, and quoted by many in the United States and in England, to prove the anti-slavery character of that body; but the abolitionists who were in that convention are beginning to see that they were "sold." Before citing the resolution, I must explain that one of the objects of the convention was to consider their relations to slavery in their home missions. The American Home Missionary Society is sustained by Presbyterians and Congregationalists, and has between fifty and sixty churches in the slaveholding States, in which slaveholding is no bar to communion. Quite an important part of the convention wished to remedy this. A committee was appointed on home missions and slavery, but they could not agree. Two reports were brought in, the majority and the minority. Neither suited the convention, and the subject was re-committed, which resulted in the "mean-nothing" resolution, which was adopted "without debate"—a pretty sure evidence that it had no point, or some one in such a body would have discovered it and raised the alarm. It is as follows:—

"Resolved, That in the opinion of this convention it is the tendency of the Gospel, where ever it is preached in its purity, to correct all social evils and destroy sin in all its forms; and it is the duty of missionary societies to grant aid to churches in the slaveholding States, in the support of such ministers only as shall so preach the Gospel and inculcate the principles and the application of Gospel discipline, that with the blessing of God it shall have its full effect in awakening and enlightening the moral sense in regard to slavery, and in bringing to pass the speedy abolition of that stupendous wrong; and that wherever a minister is not allowed so to preach, he should, in accordance with the directions of Christ in such cases, depart out of that city."

The resolution sets out with a universally admitted truth. The first important point is the duty of missionary societies to grant aid to churches . . . . "in the support of such ministers only as shall so preach the Gospel," &c. These slaveholding churches, then, are left to provide themselves with a Gospel suitable to their own taste, the missionary society simply furnishing the aid required. The Society aids the church, not the minister; hence a

slaveholding church, in selecting its own minister, is not very likely to choose an anti-slavery man. There is doubtless a difficulty here, but it demands serious attention. Churches should be independent, as far as possible, to select their own minister and exercise their own discipline; but, seeing that they are dependent upon the Home Missionary Society for support, that Society ought to have some other guarantee that the Gospel is so preached, and that discipline is so exercised, as to result in the abolition of slavery, besides the testimony of these churches, or even supported by ministers of other slaveholding churches, else we see that all these churches might be slave holding, buying, selling, and breeding churches; the minister might preach the doctrine that the Bible sanctioned the institution of slavery; and, upon their own testimony that the Gospel is "so" preached, might receive the support of the Missionary Society. With respect to the "Gospel being so preached as to have its full effect in enlightening the moral sense in regard to slavery," the really abolition portion of that convention meant in regard to the *sinfulness* of slavery. But the resolution does not mean that. By a "stupendous wrong" they meant a stupendous *sin*. But the resolution does not mean that. The expression, "enlightening the moral sense," is exceedingly indefinite; to call it by its right name, it is a cheat, for the "enlightening" of the "moral sense" means nothing at all, unless it means in regard to the *sinfulness of slaveholding*; but it does not mean that, as I shall show. For instance, change the resolution as follows—"that, with the blessing of God, it shall have its full effect in enlightening the moral sense in regard to 'the *sinfulness of slaveholding*,' and in bringing about the speedy abolition of that stupendous *sin*," and that resolution could not have passed. The *sinfulness of slaveholding* was not acknowledged; such a proposition would have met with the most determined opposition. Slavery, without meaning anything definite, would have received some rough treatment at the hands of that body; but alter the word to *slaveholding*, and the whole scene entirely changes. It is not generally understood, but it ought to be, that there were men in that convention who are most unceasing in their efforts to protect slaveholding from being condemned as sinful, only on the ground that there are some slaveholders who are such from circumstances which they cannot control, and who are doing all that they can for the good, present and future, of the slaves. Such slaveholders no one ever thinks of censuring. Still we should feel bound to refuse them church fellowship, on the ground that it is not possible to open the fellowship to such, without opening it to all sorts of slaveholders. Our principle is, *no concession under any circumstances*. But this does not at all affect the general principle that slaveholding is a sin; if the system of slavery be a sin, the system of slaveholding must be; the former cannot exist without the latter; yet the great system of slaveholding finds a refuge in these few exceptions. Men who will thus cover up or shield such a system as American slavery, and the whole of its supporters, behind the integrity of the exceptional cases, subject our charity to a severe tax. Yet, the Albany convention did, in effect, by adopting this resolution, offer protection to the entire system of slavery; it gives the power to slaveholding churches to decide whether the Gospel is so preached; it gives their own discipline into their own hands; it nowhere condemns slavery and slaveholding as sinful; nay, it was even a studied evasion of this very question, which none can fail to see when they read the following report of the majority, which the convention refused to adopt. It is as follows:—"Believing that those who, for their own advantage, hold and use their fellow-men as slaves, violate a cardinal principle of true religion, and ought not to be received into Christian churches, it is our opinion that churches which recognise such slaveholders as worthy of membership ought not to receive aid from the American Home Missionary Society; and therefore, in dispensing the funds with which it is entrusted by the Christian public, it should give aid to such churches only as refuse such recognition."

Nothing can be plainer: the Albany convention did *not* believe that those who, for their own advantage, hold their fellow-men as slaves, "violate a cardinal principle of true religion;" they did *not* believe that they "ought not to be received into Christian churches;" and as if to mark their position still more clearly, when a resolution condemnatory of the Fugitive Slave Law was introduced, it received "strenuous opposition," was "postponed," and "finally waived."

The organ of the Congregational denomination afterwards claimed it as a triumph that the above resolution and its supporters were defeated. It says: "There were fears that men of extreme anti-slavery opinions . . . might insist on the adoption of their own distinctive views by the convention, at whatever cost; but nothing of the kind came to pass." This is how such men as adopt the principles of the above resolution are distinguished in America; such men there were in the Albany convention, and posterity will rightly estimate the service they rendered to the cause of freedom and Christianity.

I will simply add, that it was thought that the resolution which was adopted was designed to affect the American Home Missionary Society; no doubt the "extreme" men did design this; and could they have had the interpreting of the resolution, it would have affected it. But they had not, hence it has not had the effect to produce any change in the Society, and

there can be little doubt but that the resolution was worded in that apparently forcible but actually mean-nothing phraseology, purposely that it might prevent a change in that Society's policy. That it did in no way affect it, is abundantly manifest; the Committee says: "Our faith is so strong that it is the tendency of the Gospel, wherever it is preached in its purity, to destroy sin in all its forms, that the Society intends to *persevere in thus preaching it.*" Then fully to demolish the resolution, they say: "The Society feels that it stands on the same ground as the New School Presbyterian and Congregational churches, and is *fully sustained by their action,*" the action of the Assembly and the Albany convention. From this it will be seen, that, whereas before the assembling of the Albany convention that Society was related to slavery, the resolution which was adopted purporting to dissolve that relation has in no degree affected it; on the contrary, the Society expressly declares that it "does *not* make the exclusion of slaveholders from communion a condition of missionary aid," points to the Albany convention resolution, and says, in pursuing this course we feel "fully sustained by your action."

I think I have done what I undertook to do, namely, to show that the Congregationalists are not "the uncompromising opponents of the accursed system," nor the "enemies of slavery" in any other sense than it is true of our northern Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists.

Would that this exposure had fallen into other hands! To exhibit my own denomination in this humiliating light has been extremely painful, but in doing it I feel that I have performed a sacred obligation to God, and to the cause of freedom. But while there is so much to regret, there is abundant cause for rejoicing when we see such a steady growth of religious feeling against slavery in nearly all the churches of most of the denominations. Here is our hope, and our only hope, for the utter extinction of slavery, in viewing slavery and slaveholding as a "sin against God;" in proportion as this feeling prevails will the foundation of slavery be removed, until it shall fall, with no hope of ever rising again. May God speed that day! I am, gentlemen, yours respectfully,

JAMES VINCENT,

Agent of the American Reform Tract and Book Society.

119, Grove Place, Bury New Road,  
Manchester, Sept. 26th, 1854.

## OUR OWN ACCOUNT WITH THE "BRITISH BANNER."

And here we will trouble the reader to turn back to page 24, and read, in the editorial of the *Banner*, the closing paragraph. Presuming that the reader has perused that passage, we remark, then, that this attack is a most wanton and *Banner*-like attempt at the very worst forms of assassination. No man, no spirit but the *Banner's*, could have perpetrated such wickedness. He says, "On his advent we showed him kindness (we will look at this soon), and, on the strength of the testimonies he brought us, we published a paragraph in his favour; but there we stopped." Why did he not stop before? He says, "We felt constrained resolutely to refuse insertion to his letters to the Congregational Union, considering it our duty to know more *both of the man and of his mission* . . . and we have only been confirmed by time and *circumstances* in the soundness of the views we have taken." Why did not the *Banner* give the public the benefit of the circumstances? Why talk about them without giving them? Does he suppose that the public are about to take the insinuations or even the *word* of the *Banner*? Does he, who revels in the luxury of defaming private character, flatter himself that he is to be heard and no one besides?

Now, it happens that the Editor has known us for years, not personally, but by reputation. It must be nine or ten years since that he thought two articles, at least, of ours worthy of a place in the *Christian Witness*. When we were about leaving for the United States, six years since, we received a letter from him, wishing us success. While we were in Oberlin, we wrote to him, and gave him permission to publish our letter, not supposing for a moment that he would; but he did. That was not all; a gentleman, whom we met in America, told us that he heard a part of that letter read, on the Sabbath, by the Editor, to his church and congregation, when he spoke of us in terms of respect, and told his people that they would see the letter in the *British Banner*. It appeared; and—if we are in error we wish to be corrected, but, as our memory serves us—there was in addition nearly a column added as an editorial, from the Editor's own pen. Now, why, before he allowed us, in the *Christian Witness*, directly to harangue a vast Christian community on "behalf of poor young men who are willing to devote themselves to missionary labour," did he not wish to learn more of the man? Why, without knowing any more of him, did he speak in such terms as he did to his church of him; and again, in his editorial in the *British Banner*? We are utterly at a loss to account for his malignity now. Before we went to America there was no man, saving our sire, for whom we felt such unfeigned regard as we did for him. Since

we have been in America, we have often heard him spoken of with disrespect, and we have felt grieved and have resented it. But such has been our experience since we have been in England, coupled with our observation of how he has behaved to others, that we are forced to believe that he is utterly destitute of regard for truth and justice.

We will now look for a moment at his "kindness." True, we did write to him before we came, supposing that he was a decent, respectable, and influential man, but we soon found that he was neither. We called on him and were bedaubed with his flattery; we were invited to take tea with him, that he might have "a regular Yankee chat." But the day was to be set, and it has *yet to be*. We called at his office by his invitation, but he was "so full of law" that he could not attend to us. The second time we called he was more indifferent than before, and inquired what our "business" was. Never till that moment had we known a single thought adverse to him. We briefly re-stated our errand, showed him our credentials, when the following were his words. Looking at the names of the directors of the Society and its officers, he said, "Well, Mr. Vincent, you know that these names may be good, or they may not. I know nothing of them, and were it not that I have every confidence in *you*, I should not feel at liberty to take up this matter at all, for you know we have had so many *humbugs* here from America. Ah! Mr. Vincent, splendid humbugs—splendid humbugs!" We here mentioned the name of Lewis Tappan, upon which the Editor said, "Well, you know, I don't think anything of *him*; I've no opinion *at all* of him; he was over here some years since, and I had some little set-out with him, so *his* name is of no use with *me*. No, Mr. Vincent, I know *you* from your correspondence, and that's enough. Why, you would be *astonished* if I were to tell you what a difficult thing it is to keep the public free from imposition. There was a missionary society, some time since,—it had obtained a hold, but you know the press is a powerful weapon, nothing like it, and I succeeded, after awhile, in putting a stop to its proceedings. Then there is the Temperance movement; it is a very good cause, but there are so many infidels mixed up with it, and such goings on, that you would be surprised. I am keeping my eyes open, and [pointing to a drawer] I have enough papers in that drawer, Sir, to crush the whole movement, and I don't know but I shall have to do it yet." We sat and listened with astonishment, and thought, "Is this the man whom we have thought so much of?" We folded up our letters and departed, having obtained the promise of a paragraph in the *Banner*. From that moment we have had such a horror of his character as no words can express. So much for his "kindness."

But, thanks to God, that weapon (the press) is failing him. We speak that we do know, and testify what we have heard from hundreds of lips, that he has not the influence that he imagines. We have never but once, in all our travels in England for the last ten months, heard but one man speak a good word for him; but we have everywhere heard the *utmost contempt* expressed for him and his *Banner*. We have had more trouble to find that paper than any other; and once we travelled over *forty* miles purposely to see if we could find any one who took it, that we might, if possible, find a back number. We went into the largest commercial reading-room, and asked the gentleman whose business it was to give information, if they took the *British Banner*. He replied, "No, Sir, we don't take such a *thing* as that here." We asked if he could tell us where it was taken. He was kind enough to direct us to the Mechanics' Institute. We asked the gentleman there, if the *British Banner* was taken, and he stared. We said that it was a weekly newspaper, and he wanted to know *what it was like*. Not finding it there, we were directed to the only place where it was at all probable that we might find it; so we went and asked Mr. W. if he took the *British Banner*? He replied, with a good deal of transport, "No, Sir, and I can tell you that you won't get it in this town." We replied, that we were very sorry, for we had come over *forty* miles on purpose to find it. "Well," he said, "I don't suppose that you could find any one in this town who would give it house-room." Here, then, was a town of many thousands of inhabitants, at least three Independent churches, and such an estimate of the *British Banner*! This is gratifying, and is one of the signs of the times, that people are getting tired of despotism.

In addition to our labours, which are already quite enough for one man, we shall feel it to be a duty religiously to aim at the furling of the *Banner*. We shall henceforth take this upon ourselves. We consider it a duty to do it. We believe it to be the duty of every one to aim at it. Let any one but refer to the act of despotism not long since perpetrated on the Rev. Mr. Tiddy. An Editor that will allow a minister of the Gospel to be represented in his columns as heretical, from a single extract from his sermon, confirm it, and not suffer the man to speak in his own defence, is worse than a highway robber. If this is to be allowed, every minister in Christendom may be branded as heretical, for there is seldom a sermon preached that is good for anything, but contains some passages which, taken apart, would be pronounced heretical. We say, then, without knowing anything of Mr. Tiddy, or his sermon, that this act of blasting a man's reputation, and then not suffering him to be heard in defence, is most *base*.

Mr. Tiddy and others, however, may console themselves with the thought that "the end draweth nigh;" yea, we mistake if it be not even at the doors.

We shall now look at the *British Banner* in a light which, we think, will convince the few remaining supporters that it is time to leave it to its fate. We mean, as

## THE ENGLISH ORGAN OF THE PRO-SLAVERY PARTY IN AMERICA.

The reader, then, will understand that the *British Banner* is the English organ of the pro-slavery party in America, and here is our proof. When the Editor announced the thirty-fifth anniversary of the American Board of Foreign Missions, in the *Christian Witness*, he said, "The Board were urged to declare it (slavery) a sin against God and man, that they will employ no slaveholders as their missionaries or agents, and that its existence is inconsistent with the Christian religion, and conjured to receive no moneys contributed, in one or another way, by slaveholders, or any of the proceeds of slave labour. As usual, the petitions are referred to a committee, and, as usual, the committee reports that, as a Board, they can have no connexion or sympathy with slavery, but the 'object'—'the Board have confined themselves to this one object.' They cannot turn aside from it, or mix any other concerns with it. And they 'still think the Saviour of the world will approve of this deliberate purpose, and would frown upon them if they should depart from it.' Reader, mark this! So, the treasury of the Board is replenished with the price of blood! Dealers in the bodies and souls of men are embraced as brethren in Christ; and the thrice-accursed produce of oppression and wrong, tears and groans, agony and death, is gratefully received by this association of merciful men, and sent abroad to promote the salvation of the Gentiles!"

Now, mark! this is the language of the Editor of the *British Banner*, in the *Christian Witness*, in 1844. That same American Board's treasury is, this very day, "replenished with the price of blood." "Dealers in the bodies and souls of men are now embraced as brethren in Christ;" and now "the thrice-accursed produce of oppression and wrong, tears and groans, agony and death, is gratefully received by this association of merciful men, and sent abroad to promote the salvation of the Gentiles;" and the Editor of the *British Banner* says, "So long as the American Board of Foreign Missions continues to breathe this (its present) spirit, and pursue this (its present) course, it shall not fail to find defenders in the columns of the *British Banner*." The spirit and the course of the American Board is precisely that above stated. Is not the *British Banner* the English organ of the pro-slavery party in America?

The Editor suppressed the Rev. J. B. Walker's speech on the pro-slavery character of our churches and societies, including the American Board; and afterwards, when he was publicly exposed for this, added insult to that gentleman, calling him, in the language of the *Banner*, a "respectable man," and says that he "made a respectable speech." Is this the way to speak of a man, whose labour in the cause of religion and philanthropy can never be over-estimated? He afterwards suppressed the foregoing letters to the Congregational Union, exhibiting the character of the American Board; and when he finds that, in spite of all his efforts to keep the public in the dark on this subject, and thus to make way for the American Board, the Congregational Union, in a most emphatic manner, turned it from them, he turns upon the author of those letters, and makes an assassin-like attempt at his reputation, by saying that he felt it to be his duty to "know more of the man and his mission," and that he has "only been confirmed by time and circumstances in the soundness of the views" he has "taken," when he had known him for years, had publicly eulogised him, and privately flattered him. This is how we prove that the *British Banner* is the English organ of the pro-slavery party in America, by showing the Editor's own perfidy to the cause of freedom, his deceitful and abusive treatment of those most intimately connected with the anti-slavery cause, and his offer of the columns of the *British Banner* to the American Board of Missions. But we have yet another proof, for we find him representing that the American Board of Missions must be worthy of support, because, forsooth, a few distinguished individuals in Scotland were found at a meeting where resolutions were passed in favour of the American Board's mission in Turkey. But who are they? We do not know them all, nor any of them personally; it is sufficient for our purpose that Dr. Candlish was one. For the sake of better coming at what Dr. Candlish is, we will just refer back to the formation of the Evangelical Alliance, which is still fresh in the minds of most persons. On that occasion Dr. Candlish moved the following resolution:—

"That whilst this Committee deem it unnecessary and inexpedient to enter into any question, at present, on the subject of slaveholding, or on the difficult circumstances in which Christian brethren may be placed in countries where the law of slavery prevails, they are of opinion that invitations ought not to be sent to individuals who, whether by their own fault, or otherwise, may be in the unhappy position of holding their fellow-men as slaves."

Upon this resolution Mr. George Thompson, at a great meeting held in Edinburgh, on the 27th May, 1846, thus commented:—"I think Dr. Candlish should be ashamed of himself for *taking the money of slaveholders, and admitting them to his Communion Table*, and then sneakily proposing such a resolution at Birmingham. I think the resolution grossly unjust, and inconsistent in terms; and the description given of the situation of slaveholders an entirely false one. The resolution has neither courage, honesty, consistency nor truth to recommend it."

The following extracts are taken from the speeches and writings of Dr. Candlish, as contained in the *Edinburgh Witness*, in the months of March and May, 1845:—"I desire it to be thoroughly understood, that we must oppose this principle, that slaveholding is, in every case, to be visited with a summary course of discipline." "*Let us be in a position in which they cannot say to us, 'you are taking up an extreme principle, not sanctioned by the Word of God,' that slaveholding is, in itself, a ground of exclusion from the Lord's Table.*"

Well might Mr. Thompson, in referring to these opinions, exclaim, "Alas, for the bondmen of America!"

"Yet, yet, degraded men! the expected day  
That breaks your bitter cup is far away;  
Trade, wealth, and fashion ask you still to bleed,  
And holy men give *Scripture for the deed.*"

Dr. Candlish was the leading champion of the Free Church in the great contest which was occasioned by that body having received £3000 from slaveholders and their friends. Enough. We presume that none will think any better of the American Board, after knowing what Dr. Candlish is, and that he has commended it; or of the *British Banner*, for this attempt to bolster up such an institution with such a man's name.

The editorial of the *Banner* on the *Morning Advertiser* and the Congregational Union will be re-printed in America, as the best proof that can be furnished that the Editor is no longer to be trusted as an anti-slavery man, and it remains to be seen how long the people in this country will tolerate him in any shape.

In the *British Banner* of November 1st, 1854, the Editor is apparently quite in good humour because he has an extract of a letter from Dr. Pomroy, one of the Secretaries of the American Board, in which he says, "he has no hesitation in saying that the statements of Mr. Vincent respecting the position and influence of the Board regarding slavery, are *utterly false.*" Dr. Pomroy knows better, and that none of our statements are untrue, and so does the Editor of the *British Banner*. If this paper were not given up to the protection of slaveholders and slavery supporters, no such a libel would have found its way into its columns.

In closing what we have to say about him, we would ask, has not the editor of the *British Banner*, by building again the things that he destroyed, become a transgressor?

---

## FROM THE "MORNING ADVERTISER" OF MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1854.

We have met with nothing for a long time past that has given us greater pleasure than the report of the proceedings of the Congregational Union at Newcastle-on-Tyne, on Wednesday last. We need not say that we refer to that part of the proceedings which relate to the question of American slavery. The Rev. D. Cullen, of Leith, submitted to the meeting a resolution expressive of sympathy with the American Board of Missions in their efforts to Christianise Turkey; but, at the same time, reiterating the condemnation, in *words*, which the Union had, on the previous year, pronounced against slavery on the other side of the Atlantic. The object of Mr. Cullen's motion, as far as it related to slavery, was to protect its members against the imputation which might otherwise have been sought to be attached to it,—of conniving at slavery, because the American Board of Missions practically abet that "sum of all villanies."

We are glad to find that there were present at this Congregational gathering some noble spirits, who saw through this discreditable attempt to slur over the enormity of American slavery—an "institution" which becomes doubly odious in the eyes of every right-minded man, when he sees it supported by men belonging to the various religious denominations of America. And, to make matters worse, those persons who are most flaming in their professions of attachment to the cause of evangelical religion on the other side of the water, are the very men who are the most strenuous in their advocacy of the system of slavery.

If there be any difference in this respect among the various evangelical denominations in America, the Baptist body are the worst of all. We have shown, on former occasions, that many of their number—ministers as well as members of their churches—are not only the advocates of slavery, but are actually slaveholders—*proprietors* of men, made as much in their

Maker's image as themselves. The Congregationalists, too, are deeply involved in the guilt of slaveholding. Nor can the Presbyterians plead that they are much less criminal. With regard, again, to the Wesleyan Methodists—though they have not, perhaps, earned for themselves so unenviable a notoriety as some other sects by their advocacy of slavery—they are, in proportion to their number, more guilty than any other denomination, with the exception of the Baptists, in the matter of holding slaves.

We will not pause to point out how utterly and irreconcilably at variance the institution of slavery is with the spirit, doctrines, and precepts of the Gospel which these various denominations preach. But, notwithstanding the glaring inconsistency of the slaveholding and slave-defending practices of these evangelical ministers and churches, with the religion of which they are the recognised and systematic teachers, there are large numbers of the religious portion of the community in England who hold out to their "American brethren," as they are called, the right hand of fellowship, and welcome them, when they come to this side of the Atlantic, to their houses, their churches, and their pulpits. And even when our religious men meet in denominational capacities, they shrink from taking any decided course with the view of putting down the enormous iniquity of American slavery. They have no objections to pass resolutions condemnatory of slavery in the abstract. So they have done for nearly a quarter of a century. But of what avail have these resolutions been? None whatever. The American pro-slavery churches care nothing for condemnatory resolutions passed on this side of the water. They do not heed these expressions of abstract sentiment any more than they would the idle wind. They would have no objection to seeing such resolutions passed by the score every day, all the year round. So long as the religious bodies in England fraternise with them, and receive them with open arms when they visit this country, the Dr. Beards, the Dr. Springs, the Dr. Deweys, the Rev. Mr. Primes, &c., make a jest of the resolutions which are passed by our evangelical bodies against transatlantic slavery.

What, for instance, did the American pro-slavery divines and slaveholding churches in the United States care for the condemnatory resolution in reference to slavery, passed by the Congregational Union last year? That condemnatory resolution was mere words. It meant nothing. It was followed by no action on the part of the Congregational Union. In short, it was nothing more nor less than a mockery of the wrongs of the 3,250,000 human beings held in a cruel and degrading bondage in the Southern States of America. It was actually proposed at the Congregational Union on Wednesday last, notwithstanding the acknowledged pro-slavery principles and practices of the American Board of Foreign Missions, that the Christian denominations of this country should identify themselves with that body,—a body who systematically expunge from every book they issue anything and everything which is opposed to slavery. But, as we have already remarked, there were happily some noble spirits in the Newcastle assembly, and they succeeded in the end, by the bold and manly opposition which they offered to the resolution alluded to, in compelling its withdrawal.

Prominent among this little band of noble men stood the Rev. Walter Scott, Principal of Airedale College. Mr. Scott expressed himself on the subject in a manner worthy of his name, and of his profession as a minister of that Gospel which regards all men as equal. We are sorry that a full report of his speech has not reached us. All that has reached us we repeat in the most conspicuous part of our paper:—"So deeply," the rev. gentleman said, "did he feel on this point, that he would protest against the resolution, even if he stood alone in so doing. The brethren ought to be aware that the American Board of Missions was connected with slavery in various ways; they had slaveholding churches, and they held doctrines, which, in his opinion, were totally opposed to the principles and spirit of the New Testament. That Board, let it be known, sanctioned the doctrine that poor little (negro) children might be torn away from their parents, and sent to slavery in distant localities. America was the stronghold of slavery, and if it could be abolished there, it would speedily cease to exist throughout the world; and yet he was sorry to say professing Christians in America were its principal stronghold. He had no doubt whatever, that if all the Christians in America would but come forward and perform their duty in protesting against slavery, it would soon be abolished, not only there but throughout the world. The part which the churches of America took with regard to slavery, was one of the most melancholy and appalling spectacles which could be presented to them. He believed that the infidelity of the United States was largely attributable to the anti-scriptural position of the American churches with regard to slavery. He could not help thinking that if he himself had known nothing more of Christianity than could be learned from the American slaveholding churches, he should have been an infidel himself. He thought, therefore, that they ought not to have any official connexion with the American Board of Foreign Missions."

These sentiments were received with the heartiest cheers. And they were deserving of the plaudits with which their utterance was greeted. After an explanatory observation from the Chairman, Professor Scott resumed,—“He had no doubt that many of the supporters of the



American Board would use strong expressions against slavery; but if they did not come forward in their pulpits and on their platforms to speak against it—if they did not unite with and assist those societies which laboured to bring about its abolition—he thought they were really supporting it by their actions. He did not know what he should do in America, but he would not, at any rate, be shackled in speaking against slavery, which he would do, he hoped, even if he had to supplicate the Almighty to give him grace to die for it. He felt deeply on this point, and would greatly regret that they should in any way sanction or assist the American Board. Before they took any steps to assist that body, he advised them to peruse the letters of Mr. Vincent, the agent of the American Reform Tract and Book Society. If they did so, they would be fully convinced that the American Board of Foreign Missions was deeply implicated in the subject of slavery. When they published an English book they took care to expunge every sentence condemnatory of slavery. They had done this with many English productions. He would do all in his power to Christianise Turkey, but he hated slavery. When a boy, he used to hate slavery; and when he used to read about Cæsar and Alexander, he used to wish for their large armies to put an end to slavery everywhere. He would put down slavery now, if he had the power, and therefore he protested against the resolution."

The noble sentiment, that if Mr. Scott were in America, and were prevented speaking against slavery, he would supplicate the Almighty for grace to enable him to die for the slave, was, we are told, received with tremendous cheering. It would have been strange had it been otherwise. The sentiment appeals to the higher and holier feelings of human nature, and such an appeal never was made, and never can be made in vain. The powerful impression which Professor Scott produced, only shows that, were the question of American slavery properly brought before the English public, we should soon see a feeling of such intense and universal indignation raised in this country against the slaveholding and slavery-abetting churches in the United States, as would compel them to sever themselves from their unhallowed pro-slavery connexions,—in which case the hideous edifice would instantly fall to the ground.

## FROM THE "MORNING ADVERTISER," OCTOBER 30TH, 1854.

We directed attention on Saturday to two letters which we then published, and to which we gave every possible prominence, in reply to a recent article of our own on the conduct of the Congregational Union relative to American slavery. That article has produced a great sensation. Both our correspondents—the Rev. Cuthbert Young, and the Rev. George Smith—have done us an injustice. They have represented us as putting the case more strongly than any words we have employed would warrant them in doing. If the resolution to which they refer was so vague as to be liable to misconstruction, that surely was no fault of ours. And that there was something in it which, indirectly or by implication, was at least supposed to sanction American slavery, is made sufficiently clear from the fact, that not only did Professor Scott and the Rev. Mr. Rogers offer a fierce opposition to it, and were cheered for so doing, but it was deemed expedient to withdraw it altogether. Now, why, if the resolution was not—at least, in appearance—open to the imputation of giving some sort of countenance to American slavery, should those who brought it forward, and gave it their sanction, agree to withdraw it? If it was not liable to any such misconstruction, it should have been persisted in, and been adopted by the Assembly.

We are borne out in the view we took of the matter by the *Christian Times*; for that journal distinctly admits, while maintaining that Professor Scott laboured under a misconception as to the construction which could be fairly put on the resolution, that "the apprehensions of Mr. Scott were apparently shared by the Assembly," and that, on that account, the resolution was withdrawn.

We must also remind the Rev. Cuthbert Young and the Rev. George Smith—two gentlemen of the highest character, and for whom we entertain the greatest respect—that the course which the Rev. Mr. Cullen, who moved the resolution, pursued, was calculated to create the impression, that it was the intention of its supporters to give some measure of countenance, though indirectly, to American slavery. That gentleman, in the course of his speech, betrayed a decided disposition to go out of his way to eulogise the American Board of Missions. Now, we all know that that body is steeped to the ears in slavery. A large proportion of its more prominent members are the avowed apologists of the "peculiar institution." And it is well known that, in their collective capacity, they expunge from all the books they issue any and every passage which is in the slightest degree condemnatory of slavery. If, then, the mover of the resolution displayed so eager a desire to heap praises on the American Board of Missions, it was surely a fair presumption that the resolution itself had, as part of its object, in some way or other, "to slur over," as we remarked on Monday, "the enormity of American slavery."

We are, however, bound to accept the assurances of our two rev. correspondents, that

the mover and supporters of the resolution did not intend by it to give the slightest countenance to American slavery, even indirectly; but we beg to ask the members of the Congregational Union, whether they feel that they have faithfully performed their duty to their Maker, to their own consciences, and to the 3,250,000 of their fellow-creatures held in bondage in the southern States of America, by merely passing resolutions condemnatory of slavery, when the experience of many years has taught them that such abstract condemnation of slavery makes no more impression on the pro-slavery divines of America than water does on the adamant rock? We have characterised all such resolutions, when not openly, vigorously, and perseveringly followed up by *action*, as no better than a mockery of the wrongs of the slaves. The Rev. Mr. Smith, it is true, tells us that the Congregational Union have taken *action* on the subject of American slavery. But what do our readers suppose that action is? Let our rev. correspondent answer the question. "I beg to inform you," says Mr. Smith, "that the adoption of the resolution was followed by all such action as the Committee of the Union were able to take. The resolution was advertised in many journals in this country, and in the United States, and it was sent by me to the officers of all the principal ecclesiastical organisations of America, with a request that it might be presented for serious consideration in their next assemblies or conventions, and be published in their denominational periodicals."

So, then, *this* was the sort of action which the Congregational Union took, after passing, in May last, its resolution condemnatory of American slavery! They caused the resolution to be advertised in certain public journals on both sides of the Atlantic, and submitted it to the consideration of the ecclesiastical organisations of America. Now, really, is not this a lamentable trifling with one of the gravest questions that ever came before a company of Christian men, chiefly composed of ministers of the Gospel? Can Mr. Smith persuade himself that this will produce the slightest impression on the pro-slavery divines of the United States? It is impossible for him to do so, because he must know that similar resolutions have been passed in England, advertised in the journals of both hemispheres for many years past, and commended to the consideration of the ecclesiastical organisations more immediately affected, and yet have never produced the slightest beneficial result.

We are told by the Secretary to the Congregational Union, that the passing and publication of such resolutions as those to which we have referred, accompanied by the recommendation he mentions, is the only action which it is competent for that body to take on the subject of American slavery. This is a mistake. There are other modes of action which may be taken. And if the Congregational Union will but pledge itself to adopt those other modes, we shall be but too happy to point them out. One mode would be, by intimating, in explicit and energetic terms, to the evangelical abettors of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic, that the members of the Union can hold no Christian intercourse with them, until they purge themselves from the guilt of defending and abetting slavery. This is one thing which the Congregational Union could have done, and ought to have done. Another mode of action which they could adopt, would be to refuse to pro-slavery divines from America the right hand of fellowship, and also to exclude them both from their pulpits and their houses. That would be a practical mode of action. It would also be an effective one. If the Congregational Union had adopted this course of procedure, as the appropriate accompaniment of their resolutions condemnatory of transatlantic slavery, they would have done that which was right. They would thereby have purged themselves from all participation, direct or indirect, in the guilt of slavery, and given a heavy blow and great discouragement to the "peculiar institution" on the other side of the water.

Are the members of the Congregational Union *now* prepared to do this? Will Mr. Smith, as the Secretary of that body, or the *British Banner*, as its very able and strenuous advocate, give us the assurance that hereafter no member of the Congregational Union will receive into his house or pulpit, or admit to the privileges of church communion, any divine from the other side of the Atlantic, who is notoriously the abettor and apologist of slavery? If either Mr. Smith or the *British Banner* can, and will, give us this assurance, we shall rejoice to admit that the members of that body have adopted a course which will clear them from the guilt of abetting slavery, and constitute such a protest against that iniquitous system, as must not only make its force felt in the western world, but as will spread consternation among the "proprietors" of men and women, made in their Maker's image. But until this course of action is adopted—until this practical mode of dealing with the colossal enormity has been carried into effect, we cannot absolve the Congregational Union from the very grave moral responsibility which they have incurred in connexion with American slavery.

## THE VOTE ON THE CHOCTAW QUESTION.

*From the New York Independent of October 5<sup>th</sup>, 1854.*

We insert the following extract from the *New York Independent*, for its apparent devotedness to the American Missionary Association. It seems to be under great concern, it has even heard it broached whether it "might not be disbanded." It is *very* anxious, for it even "trusts that no such thing will be seriously thought of." It, however, comes to the conclusion to which we ourselves come, that it is "hardly desirable, and is certainly impracticable." It even goes further, and says that "the supporters of the American Missionary Association ought not to withdraw from it without some better reason than can be found in the resolution of the Board concerning the Choctaw mission."

The *Independent* need be in no trouble, for to our certain knowledge there has been no serious talk of disbanding the American Missionary Association. It will be time enough to talk about this when the American Board shall have declared slaveholding *impossible under any circumstances in their mission churches, or in their own Board*, and shall have refused all funds contributed by slaveholders or slaveholding churches.

"In some quarters," says the *Independent*, "there seems to have been something like an expectation that the adoption of 'Mr. Treat's letter' by the Board would entirely satisfy the supporters of the American Missionary Association, and would put the two institutions on the same footing in relation to slavery and slaveholders. We have even heard an inquiry whether the Missionary Association might not be disbanded. We trust that no such thing will be seriously thought of. The Missionary Association has still its distinctive principles which the American Board has not adopted. It has its missionaries, selected and appointed by its own Committee, and its missions organised and conducted in its own way; nor is it likely that the Prudential Committee of the Board could satisfactorily conduct those missions, or be the medium of communication between those missionaries and that portion of the religious public which is pledged for their support. Each of the two institutions has its own friends and its own work, and, for the present at least, the union of the two is hardly desirable, and is certainly impracticable. The pledged supporters of the Missionary Association ought not to withdraw from it without some better reason than can be found in the resolutions of the Board concerning the Choctaw mission. In so doing they would be guilty of a breach of faith toward the missionaries who have gone forth relying on their continued contributions."

"From this point of view it is obvious that the Board must be sustained at the present crisis, and carried forward, mainly by the enlarged and continued contributions of its old and steadfast friends. Some, no doubt, who have reluctantly transferred their contributions from the 'old Board' to the new Society, will rejoice to do what they can without wronging the missionaries to whose support they are committed. Not much, however, at the most, can be expected from that quarter. On the other hand, it will not be strange if there is some little falling off in Philadelphia, in New Jersey, and even in New York, though south of Philadelphia the contributions to the Board will not be very seriously diminished. The only hope of the Prudential Committee for the means of enlarging and extending the work committed to their care, must be in the great body of the churches that have sustained them hitherto. Many have been perplexed with the position or supposed position of the Board, who have never wholly forsaken it. We may hope that they, and all who rejoice in the explicitness and Christian manliness with which it has now declared itself, will express their joy by going forward with new courage, and with a more cheerful self-denial, in co-operation with the great and venerable institution around which so many prayers and devout aspirations have gathered, and which has been so prospered in its work."

---

## THE AMERICAN REFORM TRACT AND BOOK SOCIETY.

Our present religious literature, as a whole, whether issuing from the newspaper press, or in the form of tracts and books, is not calculated to cherish and strengthen the spirit of Christian reform.

There are many thousands in the churches, and other thousands not members of churches — and the number of both classes rapidly increasing—who are earnestly endeavouring to promote the work of religious and political reformation, who search in vain for newspapers, tracts, or books, which satisfy their own wants, or offer such instrumentalities as they believe the interests of religion and Christianity do now require. These have few or no

channels through which they can reach the public mind, and give utterance to their opinions and their feelings. They are shut out as to themselves and families from what they deem proper instruction on the great questions of the day, and are excluded mostly from exerting any influence upon those decisions which involve their own most cherished interests. A large majority of these, because they cannot deprive themselves and families of religious newspapers, and do not wish to refuse to circulate tracts and books, though not what they could desire, are contributing their funds to distribute publications which are not what they wish, and the teachings of which, to a considerable extent, counteract their own best-directed efforts. This, moreover, must continue, and involve such in a dilemma more and more serious and perplexing, unless newspapers, tracts, and books can be published, which shall be the exponent of their own sentiments, and in which the good which they desire shall not be mingled with that which they condemn.

The influence of our religious literature, in newspapers, tracts, and books, and particularly books for Sabbath schools, is so great, that no reform can be carried successfully forward in opposition to their teachings, except through a counteracting power from the press itself. Such is the rapidity with which thoughts are repeated and circulated, and so universal and implicit is the reliance placed by the majority upon these sources of information, that it is almost literally true, that the printing press does the thinking of the age.

The power thus exerted in moulding the public thought is measureless, and well-nigh irresistible.

The Jesuits succeeded in staying and rolling back the tide of the Reformation, by bringing the literature and educational influences of Europe under their censorship and control, so that the whole was revised, and by erasures and additions made to bear agreeing testimony, direct or collateral, in favour of the Papacy. Rome preserves her supremacy, even now, mainly by excluding from the minds of her people the light of a Protestant literature, and confining them to teachings of her own.

These examples are sufficient to show that any attempt to create or sustain a public sentiment, by whatever instrumentalities, without the aid of the press, must necessarily and utterly fail. How much more idle to calculate upon success in any reformation, not only without the press, but against its all-pervading power.

Let us consider, then, as an illustration, the actual condition of those who are striving to separate the churches from slavery and all other known and tangible sin. What influences are leagued against them, and what means have they now for disseminating and defending their principles? There is the American Tract Society, *sending forth monthly 200,000 copies of its paper, besides its countless pages of tracts, and volumes of books; there is the Presbyterian Board of Publication, doing a similar work; and there is the Methodist Book Concern, showering the land with newspapers, tracts, books, and magazines; add to these the myriad issues of the American Sunday School Union, filling the shelves of our Sabbath-school libraries, and in the hands of our children everywhere; and consider that these millions of teachers, pervading all society, are the defenders of slavery, either by direct teaching, or by refusing to place it on the catalogue of sins, and we behold an amount of influence arrayed in defence of the slave-power, against which every effort will prove unavailing, unless supported by the counter-power of the press.* This, however, is not all. Christian reformers, while they seek eventually the overthrow of slavery, are also deeply interested in *purifying the church from a connexion with any known sin, and are convinced that no movement can be successful which is not based upon a foundation broader and deeper than a specific attack upon the system of slavery alone.* They are equally certain that no sin can be repudiated by a Christian people, while the Christian church shelters it in her bosom; for the plain reason that the morality of the world will never rise higher than the standard of the church.

It becomes, then, essential to the overthrow of slavery, or the removal of any other sin, that it be cast out of the churches and societies; and if they refuse to put the evil away, after due admonition and remonstrance, that Christian fellowship and communion should be withheld from them, as a means of reproof and discipline.

Yet it is a well-known fact, that not only do all the powerful bodies which have been named, with their immense array of means for influencing the public thought, oppose this only possible method of reform, but the almost entire strength of the religious weekly press is thrown in the same scale—not even excepting some professedly anti-slavery. These all propose to perform what sound philosophy and the experience of the world alike pronounce impossible, viz.: *to thrust out of society an evil or a sin, around which the churches have thrown the defences of their resistless sanction.*

We propose to give a few facts to show the principle upon which the churches and their societies have been acting. And we call the attention of the committees of religious societies in England to these facts, which refused to lend this Society their aid when we asked them, and in the light of them to ask, whether there is any ground upon which they can justify such a refusal? How does it appear before the world, compared with the efforts which have

been made and supported by committees, and by the religious press, on behalf of the missions of the American Board, which Board, it has been truly said, is "steeped to the ears" in the guilt of supporting slavery.

## AMERICAN TRACT AND MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

The Hon. W. Jay, in his letter to the American Tract Society, on the ground of its alliance with the slave-power, says—

"I know not that in the twenty-seven years of its existence the Society has published a line intended to touch the conscience of an American slave-breeder or trader. On the contrary, especial care has been taken to *EXPUNGE* from your reprints every expression that could even imply a censure on our stupendous national iniquity. The Society has no hesitation in condemning cruelty, oppression, and injustice, but it shrinks with affright at the very idea of acknowledging that it is cruel, oppressive, and unjust, to reduce a *black* man to the condition of a beast of burden, to deny him legal marriage, and to sell him and his children to the highest bidder, in company with the beasts of the field. This extreme sensitiveness is shown in the alteration of a passage in your reprint of Gurney's essay on the habitual exercise of love to God. Gurney says: 'If this love had always prevailed among professing Christians, where would have been the sword of the crusader? Where the African slave-trade? Where the odious system which permits to man a property in his fellow-men, and converts rational beings into marketable chattels?' (Page 142.) This was meat too strong for the digestion of the Society, and hence it was carefully diluted, so that it might be swallowed without producing the slightest nausea, as follows: 'If this love had always prevailed among professing Christians, where would have been the sword of the crusader? *Where the tortures of the Inquisition?* Where every system of oppression and wrong by which he who has the power revels in luxury and ease at the expense of his fellow-men?' (Page 199.) It was an ingenious thought to turn upon the *Inquisition* Gurney's application of his subject to slave traders and holders, and to lose sight of *property in man* in indefinite generalities.

"Your last report, in announcing the reprint of the memoir of Mary Lundie Duncan, tells us: 'A few pages which the Committee deemed of less interest to the general reader, or which alluded to *points of disagreement among evangelical Christians*, have been dropped.' The pages dropped are, indeed, few and unimportant, and seem to have been dropped for the purpose of justifying the word 'abridged' on the title-page. But the passages dropped are very significant. In her diary for March 22, 1833, the following passage is *expunged* in the Society's edition, while every other word on the page is retained: 'We have been lately much interested in the emancipation of slaves. I never heard eloquence more overpowering than that of George Thompson. I am most thankful that he has been raised up. Oh, that the measure soon to be proposed in Parliament may be effectual!'

"Poor Mary! The American Tract Society will not allow you to breathe a wish for West India emancipation by Act of Parliament, nor to admire the eloquence of an anti-slavery lecturer. The biographer of this lovely and highly-gifted saint remarks: 'When George Thompson, the eloquent pleader for the abolition of slavery, was called to visit the United States, in the hope that his remarkable power of influencing the public mind might be beneficial there, we find the youthful philanthropist, whose ardent mind glowed with exalted sympathies, and felt an interest in loftier occupations than usually kindle the enthusiasm of girls of her age, embodying her desires for his success in the following verses.' This paragraph, and the lines they introduced, are both *EXPUNGED* from your edition. A Broadway bookseller had already published an *unmutilated* copy of the book; but this religious Society, more sensitive than even *New York* traffic to the good-will of the slaveholders, suppressed not merely the anti-slavery poetry, but the testimony of a mother to the philanthropic sentiments of her departed daughter! But the work of expurgation did not stop here. In Mary's diary is the following entry:—'August 1. Freedom has dawned this morning on the British colonies. (*No more degraded lower than the brutes—no more bowed down with suffering from which there is no redress*), the sons of Africa have obtained the rights of fellow-subjects—the rights of man, the immortal creation of God. (*Now they may seek the sanctuary fearless of the lash—they may call their children their own.*) Hope will animate their hearts, and give vigour to their efforts. Oh, for more holy men to show them the way of salvation! The Lord keep them from riot and idleness! They have been so little taught, that He only can avert confusion and tumult as the result of their joy. Some Christians there are among their number who will influence others. My poor fellow-travellers through life's short wilderness, may I meet with many of you in heaven, where even I can hope to dwell through the life of my risen Lord! There none will despise the negro whom Jesus Christ hath pitied and redeemed.'

"The passages in italics and brackets are *expunged* in the Society's edition."

The Rev. Mr. Torrey, of East Cleveland, said at a Christian Anti-slavery Convention, held in Ravenna, in 1852, that, at a monthly prayer-meeting, he thought proper to remember the slave, and turned to the 72nd of Dr. Watts' Psalms, when, to his amazement, the verse that he most wanted was gone. It is as follows :—

"Blessings abound where'er He reigns:  
The joyful prisoner bursts his chains;  
The weary find eternal rest,  
And all the sons of want are blest."

Another hymn, which had a beautiful sentiment in it, was mutilated in deference to the slave-power. The hymn was headed, "Who is my neighbour?" and each verse was a reply to the question. The following reply was not allowed to remain :—

"Thy neighbour! Yonder toiling slave!  
Fettered in thought and limb,  
Whose hopes are all beyond the grave,  
Go thou and ransom him."

Such are some of the doings of our Tract and Missionary Societies in America; and should the Religious Tract Society of England be in friendly correspondence with a Society which thus helps to rivet the chains of the slave?

## SUBSERVIENCY OF SCHOOL LITERATURE TO THE SLAVE-POWER.

It is not to be supposed that the morality of the world will rise higher than the standard of the church. When religious bodies refuse to teach the sinfulness of oppression, we are not surprised that men, whose only object is gain, will hesitate to adopt the course of these bodies when they can profit by it.

A writer in the *New York Tribune* noticed an advertisement in the "Trade Sale Catalogue" as follows :—

"Alabama Readers, in four parts, prepared expressly for schools in the Southern States."

"Part Fourth—Rhetorical Exercises, &c., by Dr. Porter, late of Andover Theological Seminary."

Dr. Porter died in 1834, twenty years ago. Since then, his book has been mutilated to answer the purpose of the slave-power. When this "Rhetorical Reader" came from Dr. Porter's hands, it contained Cowper's touching "Negro Complaint," and "The Abolition of the Slave Trade." Upon comparing that prepared for schools in the Southern States with the authentic copy, the writer in the *Tribune* says,—"for the 'Negro's Complaint' I found substituted 'Spirit Selling, a Curse to the Seller;' and for the 'Abolition of the Slave Trade,' the 'Basis of Infidelity.'" Thus slavery degrades the religious societies and publishers.

Nor are authors themselves less censurable for degrading their own works to pander to the foul system of slavery. We choose to quote from the writings of a gentleman well known by us, whose authority is unquestionable. "I believe," says he, "that there are men of genius in the Free States, who, like Lovejoy, would sacrifice their lives before they would sacrifice their honour to the Juggernaut of slavery; yet, Paulding and Longfellow, and others, have expurgated from their works those passages against slavery, which the inspiration of their higher nature had produced. Look at Bryant and Brooks! Once they were both honoured by the lovers of American literature. Now, Bryant stands in the loftiness of his intellectual and moral nature, with the wreath of genius resting undefiled upon his brow; Brooks kneels as a menial, and shuts his eyes, while slavery spits upon his forehead."

## THE AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.

The American Sunday School Union dropped from their libraries a book entitled "Jacob and his Sons," in obedience to the slavery authority, because it contained the following passage :—

"What is a slave, mother?" asked Mary; "is it a servant?"

"Yes," replied her mother, "slaves are servants, for they work for their masters, and wait on them; but they are not hired servants, but are bought and sold like beasts, and have nothing but what their master chooses to give them. They are obliged to work very hard, and sometimes their masters use them cruelly, beat them, and starve them, and kill them; for they have nobody to help them. Sometimes they are chained together and driven about like beasts."

"Poor things!" said Mary; "but why do they not leave their masters when they use

them ill? The other day Margaret left you, mother, because she was tired of living here, though you never treated her unkindly; I wonder that the slaves stay with their masters who are not kind to them."

"They do not like to be slaves," answered her mother; "but they are not permitted to leave their masters whenever they wish. Servants are paid for working for their masters and mistresses, and if they do not like to stay, they may go and live somewhere else. But the poor unhappy slaves are obliged to stay with their master as long as he chooses to keep them. And if the master is tired of his slaves, then he may sell them to another if he wishes to."

What does the Sunday School Union of England think of that? We hope to see no more expressions of confidence from them in a Society which will be guilty of the deed of suppressing such sentiments as the above.

## THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN.

We have only room to remark that, in re-publishing Watson's Theological Institutes, in which are found some pointed remarks against slaveholders, a note is appended, evidently designed to make the impression that they are not applicable to *American* slavery.\*

## PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

Slavery has not only caused the Assembly to interpret the Bible in its favour, but it now uses the authority of that Assembly and its Boards to prevent Christians in the free States, as well as at the South, from singing and reading sentiments directly opposed to slavery. In the Hymn Book authorized by the Assembly, in the first edition, in hymn 363, the fourth verse read as follows:—

"Oh when shall Afric's sable sons  
Enjoy the heavenly word,  
And vassals long enslaved become  
The freemen of the Lord.

In recent editions and corrections of the Hymn Book *this verse is expunged*.

But this is not the only act of the kind. In a volume published by Dr. Keith, on the Evidences of Christianity, as deduced from prophecy, the author, speaking of the curse denounced upon Canaan, says it gives no warrant for slavery, and adds, "Were the Gospel universally and rightly appealed to, no other bond would be known among men than that of Christian brotherhood? But this doctrine is contrary to the opinions of the Assembly; accordingly, this whole passage is expunged from this standard edition.†

From what has been adduced it must be apparent that such a Society as the American Reform Tract and Book Society is needed in the United States. It is the object of the Directors to establish a thorough system of colportage as soon as the funds can be raised. There is a wide field now opened before it. The territory of Nebraska and Kansas, comprising an area of 485,000 square miles, is open to competition—it is to be slave-soil or free; the slave-drivers say it shall be slave-soil, the friends of freedom have resolved to keep it free, and with the blessing of God, they will do it.

The American Reform Tract and Book Society propose to send colporteurs through that vast territory, armed with a thoroughly religious anti-slavery literature; free churches are to be formed, a free press established, and, with these agencies in active operation, no one can doubt but that the blessing of God will crown them with success.

Contributions on behalf of this Society will be received by the Author, till the close of the first week in December, at 5, Hereford Terrace, De Beauvoir Town, Kingsland. After that, by Rev. W. Parkes, Hindham Vale, Collyhurst, near Manchester; Mrs. Barclay, 233, Parliamentary Road, Glasgow; Miss Cogan, Walthamstow, Essex; Miss F. C. Hawshaw, 42, Great James Street, Londonderry; Mr. G. Cox, jun., The Square, Abingdon, Berkshire; Mr. E. Webb, 5, Hereford Terrace, De Beauvoir Town, Kingsland; and Mr. M. B. Sutton, Milton Place, Deal, Kent.

We have done. In a short time we shall be on our way to renew our labours in behalf of the poor bondmen in America. We leave without accomplishing the work for which we came, but, under the all-wise superintendence of Providence, have been directed to the accomplishing of a work of far greater value to the whole cause of freedom. We are thankful for this.

With respect to our country, we love it more than ever. And our countrymen, with here and there an exception, are ready to act against slavery whenever they shall be rightly directed. The recent demonstration at the Congregational Union is sufficient proof of this. Let this action be well followed up, then the English public sentiment will begin to be felt, and tell with mighty force against the already tottering system of slavery.

\* Rev. Wm. Goodell.

† Rev. J. B. Walker.